Anti-Slavery Standard Vol. 13-14

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

S. H. GAY,
OLIVER JOHNSON, } .... Editors.

Without Concealment—Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, Corresponding Editor.

VOL. XIV. NO. 37.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1854.

WHOLE NO. 713.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, on Saturday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK. Terms, *Two Dollars* per annum. Printed, for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by NORRIS & JOHNSTON, printers, No. 21 Spruce street, New York.

Pro-Slavery.

JOHN MITCHEL'S REPLY TO THE REV. H. W. BEECHER.

From The Citizen.

REVEREND SIR: You will be surprised to see a letter addressed to you by one whom you supposed to be dead. In your Anti-Slavery Lecture, as reported in the *Tribune*, I find that you announced my decease to a large congregation; and, with Christian meekness, repressed the loud hisses of your hearers in consideration of the respect due to the deceased. This morning I have read my own epitaph in the *Tribune*, and even an account of the Coroner's inquest—which must have greatly affected my friends, if I have any left.

I find myself, therefore, in the position of Partridge, the almanac maker, who had to come before the public to prove himself alive, notwithstanding the obituary notice of Dean Swift—and had even much trouble in establishing the fact. It is a hard necessity—you may be difficult to convince; and may choose even to regard this communication as a *de profundis clamavi*, or voice from the tombs—but I will try to satisfy your reverence.

The New York *Tribune*, first—next a small fry of newspapers whose names I forget—and lastly your facetious reverence, in your paper, the *Independent*, all have poured out on me a torrent of virtuous indignation, simply because I refused to brand as criminals a large portion of the citizens of this Republic, and about one-half of all the human beings who have ever lived in the world besides. You and the *Tribune*, and the "Benevolists" of this enlightened century, have found out a new crime—as if there had not been enough before—and when any man hesitates to load his fellow-creatures, his fellow-citizens, and forefathers, and with this lately invented sin, over and above all their other sins, you cry out that he is a "caitiff," a "thistle," a "hideous hag," and a dead man. You write his epitaph and find a verdict of felo-de-se upon his corpse.

It seems, also, that I have disappointed you and the *Tribune*, which is painful. But what if the disappointment is owing not to my fault, but to your stupidity? For here is your reasoning—I tried to destroy British dominion in Ireland: but I decline to say that half of the American citizens are vile criminals; therefore "there *could be no principle* in my struggle with England." (I quote from your article in the *Indepenent*.) And the *Tribune* makes no scruple to say, "that if liberty for Ireland and the Irish is sought in the spirit evinced, and on the principles avowed by the *Citizen*, it can hardly be necessary to say that the effort will be fruitless, and the hopes of its champions a mockery. Alas! for the aspirations of the oppressed and exiled, if their incitement to struggle for liberty is the horrible desire of buying, selling, and lashing each other." I confess I can make no sense out of such language. Benevolence is good, but a little logic also would be no harm. Let us see how it would apply to another case. General Washington, the father of his country, saw no crime and no peccadillo in holding slaves, and making them work on his farm. General Washington wished to possess, and did possess till he died, and always took good care of, a plantation stocked with negroes, not in Alabama, but in Virginia. Nay, he wished to possess *more* plantations: otherwise he certainly never would have offered $8,500 for Mr. Clifton's. Thomas Jefferson, the greatest of the founders of American democracy, lived and died a slaveholder, and bequeathed his slaves to his relatives. *Therefore* "there could be no principle in their struggle with England:" the "effort ought to have been fruitless, and the hopes of its champions a mockery:" for "their incitement"—Jefferson's and Washington's incitement—"to struggle for liberty was the horrible desire of buying, selling and lashing each other." If your reverence would boldly speak your mind, you would tell your hearers in the Tabernacle that Washington was a caitiff, and Jefferson a thistle, or a hideous hag.

I know what you will say—that those illustrious men, though slaveholders, always felt and said that Slavery was an incubus, and a curse to the country. Possibly it may be so. This is a subject on which I gave no opinion. But the National Debt is an incubus and curse to England—and yet many good men, believing it to be so, hold debentures, and even go so far as to buy stocks in the three-and-a-half per cents.

But you, crusaders of Abolition, are not content to rest the case on grounds of policy. You will have it that those who differ from you, and agree with all the wisest of mankind, are fools or villains. You have a number of exclamations and interjections always ready; and you seem to think people will take them for reason. "What!" you cry, "can a man be a chattel?"—to which I answer, Why not? The Legislator of the Jews saw no harm in it. "Would you sell a being with an immortal soul?" Certainly: Moses and the Prophets did the same. "Would you send back a fugitive to his master?" Assuredly: Paul the Apostle very honestly sent back the absconding Onesimus, and begged of his owner, the worthy Philemon—Paul's dearly-beloved and fellow-labourer—to forgive his returning slave.

Was Paul a hideous hag? Believe me, it is your reverence who is an old woman. You will never get a new code of morality received among men. We will never consent to believe that you are a better Christian than the Founder of that religion—that you love liberty better than those immortal Greeks who invented it—that you are a truer Republican than all the Republicans of ancient and modern times, and of both hemispheres. This is undoubtedly a great century, and thinks it knows much; but I have always been accustomed to thank God that I am behind my age. It is a matter of taste.

I do not affect to be ignorant that your little school claim the Founder of the Christian religion as an Abolitionist; not by reason of any positive condemnation or prohibition of Slavery or slaveholding, but by virtue of what you call the development of the religion, which you suppose to be growing and advancing as man grows and advances. Especially you dwell upon the great precept, "Do unto others as ye would that others should do unto you"—and you say *here* is Abolition in embryo. Though a laic, I shall venture to suggest to you, most learned clerk, a simple explanation of that text, which, perhaps, never occurred to you before. It means, do unto others as you would wish (if they were in your circumstances and you in theirs) that they should do unto you. If you are a creditor, treat your debtor with that forbearance and consideration which, if you were the debtor and he the creditor, you might reasonably wish and expect him to use toward you. This does not mean, creditors discharge your debtors free. Again, if you are a slaveholder, use your slave with gentleness, humanity, and kindness, rewarding him when he does well, never punishing him wantonly or oppressively—in short, just as you could reasonably wish, were you the slave and he the master, that he would behave toward you. Therefore, the injunction of the New Testament is, not masters discharge your slaves, but be merciful to your slaves—slaves be obedient to your masters.

But I said something of slaves being *lashed*. Yes: the very idea of a slave includes the idea of coercion, but does not at all include the idea of cruelty; and when I wished for a plantation of negroes, your reverence and the *Tribune*, with great candour, proclaim that I want slaves in order to have the luxury of flogging them. Does any man marry a wife that he may have the pleasure of beating his children? Yet he who spareth the rod spoileth the child. Does any man buy a horse for the sake of whipping him? Did Washington keep negroes merely that he might indulge himself in thrashing them? In fact, I wanted to set down the principle as nakedly as possible—that it is not wrong to hold a slave; from this principle it follows that it is not wrong to make a slave work; and there is no way of making him work (in the last resort) but dread of the lash.

This is an ungracious task I find myself forced to undertake. On my side, in this controversy, everything sounds harsh and looks repulsive. Your reverence has chosen, if not the better, at least the balmier part. Your's is the privilege, dear to the enlightened modern heart, of uttering kind looking sentences. It comes easy to you (for all the prevailing cants are with you) to assume for yourself and your followers the credit of benevolence, and philanthropy, and enlightenment, and "progress," and all the rest of it; while I, to escape the charge of barbarous cruelty and blood-thirsty atrocity, am forced to shield myself under the authority of mere ancients, persons behind the century, persons who had not the advantage of hearing your lecture at the Tabernacle—persons like the Legislator of the Jews, and the wise men of the Greeks and the framers of the Declaration of Independence. It would be easy for me also, and it would be true, to assert that I am not cruel or tyrannical by nature—that I hate all oppression—that, if I had slaves, I would influence and govern them uniformly by kindness instead of coercion; in short, that I would use them as humanely as Jefferson himself, whose enthusiastic reception by his attached negroes on his return to Monticello forms so agreeable a picture in Tucker's life of that illustrious man. It would be easy; but I do not condescend to treat the question in this personal and restricted manner. My position was, and is, the naked assertion, "that slaveholding is not a crime;" and that nobody ever thought it a crime until some time toward the close of the last century.

For the sake of undeceiving your disciples at the Tabernacle, I think it right now to inform them (and I do it with regret), that you are in the habit of giving so erroneous an account of Slavery among the Hebrews, that Moses himself would not know his own laws if he heard them described in one of your reverence's lectures. You say that the Mosaic law did not indeed prohibit Slavery, but surrounded the system with such restrictions as to make it very inconvenient, and finally to abolish it. The very ingenious authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," in her "Key" to the same, has asserted, quoting a Mr. Barnes for it, that although Hebrews might buy slaves, they could not sell them. And again, that there was an enactment requiring Hebrew slaveholders to liberate their slaves every fiftieth year. These are statements which you and your school seem to take on trust from Mrs. Stowe and Mr. Barnes; but you will find that it is unsafe to rely, for facts of this kind, upon pamphleteers or lady-novelists. Undoubtedly, some of your hearers, and some of the readers of "Uncle Tom," will be surprised to hear that there were no such enactments at all; except in reference to that class of slaves who were children of Israel.

The Mosaic Law commanded the Israelites to buy slaves "of the heathen who were round about;" these slaves it commanded them to take as an inheritance forever. "Ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen *forever*. But over your brethren the children of Israel ye shall not rule over one another with rigour" (Levit. xxv. 46).

In the year of jubilee, liberty was to be proclaimed throughout the land, "to all the inhabitants thereof," but, is it possible for a learned theologian like your reverence, not to be aware that foreign slaves were never spoken of as inhabitants of the land, but as strangers and sojourners. It is in this very same chapter that foreign slaves are declared to be their inheritance and their possession, and their children's possession forever. "Moses," says the learned commentator Michaelis,* "specified two periods at which *the Hebrew servant* was to regain his freedom—the 7th and the 50th," that is to say, as he explains it, at the end of seven years from the date of the slave's falling into Slavery (the sabbatical year had nothing to do with it); and at any rate, in the jubilee year, whether he had been then seven years in Slavery or not. *But nothing of all this applied to the slaves purchased from foreigners or taken in war, or to the children of such slaves.*

It is precisely as if there were a law in America whereby all American citizens, who might have fallen into the state of Slavery, were to be set free at two stated periods in each century.

If you know of any commentator worth attention who takes a different view of the matter, produce him.

And it is not true, nor is there the smallest foundation for the statement that a Hebrew slaveholder was not permitted to sell his foreign slaves. On the contrary, there is one very peculiar and exceptional case (Duet. xxi. 14), in which a master is forbidden to sell a female captive whom he had taken to wife—he shall not make merchandise of *her*. And this exceptional prohibition leads to the belief that of all other slaves he might make merchandise. Again it is said, "If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him or selleth him, then that thief shall die" (Deut. xxvi. 7). Which seems to me to prove that there were regular slave markets in Israel—otherwise the kidnapper could not "make merchandise" of his stolen brethren, and could have no temptation to steal him for sale. And, lastly, in providing for the moderate punishment of slaves with rods, the law declares that even if the slave die of his beating after a day or two, yet his master shall not be punished; for, saith the text, "he is his money." The learned commentator I cited before remarks on this passage: "In any nation where Slavery is established, a master must have a right to chastise his slaves. If they are obstinate, and provoke him into a passion, his blows may prove fatal, contrary to his inclination; but a predetermination to kill a slave will not be imputed to him"—for he is money.

Now, if a man's slave was his inheritance, and his children's inheritance, and his money, and if, in the whole Mosaic law, there is to be found but one enactment against selling, that is forbidding a man to sell his wife, if she was also his slave—forbidding it not because she was his slave, but because she was his wife—then clearly we are entitled to assume that slaves were a marketable commodity among the Jews, as they were among all other nations of antiquity.†

I hope, therefore, you will tell your hearers at your next lecture that you have been misrepresenting Moses all this time; and that, in fact, the Mosaic law imposed no restrictions upon Slavery at all, except in the case of Israelitish slaves; a class of restrictions which are here happily unnecessary, as no American citizen can sell himself into Slavery, or become a slave even for debt, as a Hebrew citizen might.

So much for authority. And as to the nature of liberty itself I believe it is a thing little understood in these times. "Liberty requires new definitions," saith Carlyle. "The true liberty of a man, you would say, consisted in his finding out, or being forced to find out the right path, and to walk therein; to learn, or to be taught, what work he actually was able for; and thus, by permission, persuasion, and even compulsion, to set about doing the same. This is his true-blessedness, honour, liberty, and maximum of well-being." Wisely, as it seems to me, the same writer again exclaims: "Surely, of all 'rights of man,' this right of ignorant man to be guided by the wiser, to be gently or forcibly held in the true course by him, is the indisputablest. Nature herself ordains it from the first. Society struggles toward perfection by enforcing and accomplishing it more and more. It is a sacred right and duty on both sides; and the summary of all social duties whatsoever between the two."

Thus the ideal of a slaveholder's position is a true patriarchate. He is the father of a family. And how much higher are his duties and responsibilities than those of a mere employer for money-wages, between whom and his labourer the sole *nexus* is cash payment! If he *do* his duty, how much higher he stands in the scale of God's creatures than the man who merely pays his workmen their wages on Saturday night, and dismisses them to the grog shop. If he do *not* his duty, or if he abuses his power, may God forgive him!

Before closing this letter, I shall quote for you a sentence or two from another keen observer of the world, Father Kenyon: "In general," he says, "I regard the whole question as one whose importance is much exaggerated by fancy—perchance by fanaticism. We are all slaves, in a thousand senses of the word; slaves to time, to place, to circumstance; to the habits of our great grandfathers on either side, and to the whims of our maternal ancestors in their nonsensical generations; to fire, air, earth and weather, throughout all their analyses; to tailors—a most galling yoke; snuff, washerwomen, quacks, policemen, umbrellas, London merchants, native millers, and royal engineers. If to all these slaveries there be superadded one other—namely, Slavery to slaveholders, I cannot see that our position will be very essentially deteriorated."

Now your reverence is a slave: a slave to certain words and phrases, which have got the mastery over your poor mind, and thus over your body too. You are as one possessed by them. They make you cry out, and gesticulate violently, and toil and sweat and revile passers-by. Who will emancipate you, unhappy congregational pastor! You call these noisy spirits that possess you *principles*, and you ask me where is my "principle." You tell me that you thought I had risen up against English dominion in Ireland "for a principle." God forbid! I trust that I have no principles of this sort; but who knows his own heart? Who can tell whether he is truly emancipated or not? Yet I do flatter myself that in seeking to throw off the dominion of England I was actuated by no other principle than intolerance of insolent and ignorant oppression; my principle was simply that Irishmen were fitted for a higher destiny and sphere, and that they all ought to feel British dominion as intolerable as I did. My principle was that even if all other Irishmen chose to submit to that mean tyranny, I for my part would choose rather to die.

You see I am but narrow-minded. My thoughts are not world-wide and sky-high, like your reverence's. Yet I submit that you have no right to call me a "pretender" (see the *Independent*), because I never did pretend to anything higher, wider or deeper than the above. Spare me, therefore, your righteous indignation; as I am so far behind the age, do not try to drag me on—I can never keep up with you. Your reverence will soon be clear out of my sight; and I wish you a good journey. Adieu.

JOHN MITCHEL.

New York, Jan. 23, 1854.

---

* Michaelis. Commentary on the law of Moses. Book III., c. 9.

† They were a "commodity transferable by purchase and sale," says Michaelis; and he has even a section devoted to an inquiry into the price usually realized. In war times, he says, when any city was taken, or victory won, the price fell greatly, because the market was glutted. The same commentator shows clearly that the punishment of death denounced against *man-stealing*, only referred to the stealing of Hebrews—the text of Exodus xxi being explained and limited by Deut. xxiv.

Selections.

ANTI-SLAVERY LECTURE BY LUCY STONE.

THERE was a lecture delivered as above last evening at the Tabernacle, which was densely crowded. The lecturer was applauded on making her appearance. She spoke to this effect:

I am more than glad to have an opportunity to say something for the Slave in this Tabernacle in New York; and I cannot help wishing, for his sake for whom I speak, that He who touched Isaiah's lips with hallowed fire would also put in my lips such words as need to be said for him who is too poor to speak for himself. There is no topic before which I feel with so deep a seriousness as this of American Slavery, which, whatever minor position others may take, towers above them and demands the earnest thought of all thinking men and women; for the question is not now, as it was in the earlier days of the Anti-Slavery cause, whether the black man south of Mason and Dixon's Line shall stand with his manhood about him, and recognised; but whether the principle of liberty is to get a foothold on the soil. Inquiring into the source of this ill is like asking who brought sin into the world; it is more useful to look for the means to root it out. It exists not here because it is a pattern of freedom, religion, honour, purity, virtue, peace; for all these wither before it; it is not among us because it is strong, and able to sustain itself; for, like every other falsehood, it is weak; it is not among us because its effect is not known, for it does not shrink out of sight, and beg the right to be; for, since the ill omened day when, 201 years ago the Dutch vessel landed in Virginia its little cargo of slaves, it has spread, until there is no part of our territory but "the trail of the serpent is over it all." There is none whose heart does not condemn it, when he thinks how he would feel were he obliged to change places with the slave. I have seen sorrows, afflictions, but nothing have I seen half so sad as the bitterness which is mixed in the cup of the slave, and all men know it. Not long ago I went to a far Western State to see a brother who had been the playmate of my early years, with whom I had grown up, whose sports and tasks I had shared: and scarcely had I reached his roof when death laid him in the grave. Pain wrung from him expressions of bitter agony, and you who have those whom you love can feel what bitter sorrow I then felt. Yet what was such grief to the grief of bondage—to the grief of him who lives a life of unrequited toil, a chattel, written in his master's ledger, a marketable commodity? And this evil continues not because we do not know it to be a crime; not because it is strong, but because those who should be courageous are cowards. When Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote that wonderful "Uncle Tom," it is said that woman, not content with having brought sin into the world, now tries to destroy the last hope of humanity by destroying this glorious Union. A little woman, scarce five feet high, wrote Uncle Tom, and straightway Congress met and re-asserted the Compromise measures and the Fugitive Slave Law as the law of the land. Was there not weakness in that? Mountains, secure on their bases, do not stoop to proclaim their strength; it is weakness that tries to reässure itself, that wildly shrieks and reënacts a law, because a woman writes a book! And now it is sought to extend it over the wide territory of the West; it is your business and mine to see that no shadow of a remnant of a root be left this wrong, whence a new destructive growth can arise. We know what are its supports; the Church and the Government; yet, traitor-like, it kills both. Like the serpent in the old fable of Laocoon, it has wound itself round both, and the glaring eyeballs of the one and the hideous contortions of the other, show the strength that is crushing them both. I am glad both are dying. Whatever takes my sister and rates her with beasts and four footed things; whatever bids a human being lay his hands on another and use him as a chattel, it is time that it died. Political parties are (thank God!) all in fragments; the Church is flying into fragments which can never re-unite; and earnest men and women, who revere such law as deserves to be revered, and live the religion taught by Him who enjoined us to do to others as we would have them do to us, are glad that it is so. In the wreck of this government I see the superstructure of another and a grander, whose base shall be the immutable rule, whose centre the throne of God, and whose extent will afford a refuge to every man and woman—and then it will be wondered at that eighteen centuries after Jesus Christ spoke on earth, any man could be found to put a hand to the execution of what are now called laws. Do not understand me as wishing government and religion destroyed; true law God's hand sustains; and to true religion the pulsations of His heart give life. We have grown blind to justice; with our blindness let Abolition begin. See how we do. In the blue waters of the Mediterranean, Captain Ingraham finds a man robbed of liberty; he is a citizen of the United States. He takes his hand and gives him freedom. For this he is praised and honoured; the whole country claps its hands, man, and woman, and all. Captain Ingraham must have his medal. But another Captain, Drayton, at a time when Louis Philippe was driven from his throne, and a sympathizing cry of liberty was sent across the Atlantic from men surrounded by their human chattels—because he stretched a hand to aid the black man robbed of his liberty, had five years of imprisonment given him, and even death came to relieve him! What has blinded our eyes? In Tuscany a poor family are punished because they would read their Bible, and our eloquent man, Edward Everett, writes a letter imploring the right for them; yet millions on millions in our land are denied this very right; and Mrs. Douglas, in Virginia, who would teach men and women to read, is imprisoned because she would. Congress votes a ship to bring Kossuth to our shores; but passes a law by which every black Kossuth in our broad republic has no inch of ground to stand on. Arkansas forms a society to promote liberty in Europe; but chains her own slaves, as when the women of Virginia, enthusiastic for those who fought for freedom in "the Isles of Greece," gathered together to make garments for the Greek women; but Randolph, seeing little naked children marching before their dwellings, told them—the Greeks were there (laughter). We shout for Kossuth and Kozeta, to drown the clank of chains and the cries for justice which arise from amid our own homes. Why, every merchant knows that if three millions of slaves were made three millions of freemen, each of them would wear three pairs of shoes for one he wears now. The slave is rated three-fifths of a man; make him free and his increased necessities will increase your markets in proportion. I lately went through into Kentucky and Missouri—the slaveholders knew I was an Abolitionist—and, though I was hissed in New York, I was there heard with manly patience, except by two women. Let me say to John Mitchel that there is no class of people in this broad Continent from whom the base utterance he made will draw on him more contempt than from the slaveholders themselves! (Great and prolonged applause.) I would he saw, as I saw, the curl of contempt on the lips of slaveholders when speaking of the way free negroes are treated at the North. In the South they are not crowded into corners; nobody changes his seat when a black man takes one near him. The Musical Fund Hall, in Philadelphia (I mention it that if any of you lecture there you may take some other hall to lecture in), would not be given me on condition of admitting black people; the same occurred in Madison, Indiana; and when I told this to slave-owners in Kentucky, they said how mean this feeling at the North was. I met none in the South (save the two women I have alluded to) who did not admit Slavery to be wrong, and so, the grand trouble was how to get rid of it; and I hope to see one day a Convention of slave-owners and Abolitionists, to consider what is best to be done. We are not understood; one man told me he had read my lectures, and found that a certain class of newspapers was not reliable. A woman told me, "I am not half the woman I would be, I am not half developed, from leaning on slaves" I said to them, "we did not know you felt so; let us meet in counsel," and the scheme did not appear to them a thing which might not one day come. In the more southern States Slavery is a matter of gain, and may be more prized; but where I was it is taking legs and running away. In Kentucky three families found on the same morning that three female slaves had fled, and one owner said: "Those who thus get their liberty deserve it." Those at the South do not hoot and hiss; they speak in a manly and courageous way, not like those of the North. A little before last winter a man in New England was asked if he went to hear Miss Stone. He answered, "Poor crazy thing—no." I was not popular in his place; I advocated Woman's Rights and Slavery both. Afterward, when I spoke in Metropolitan Hall, I saw him sit in the foremost row of the audience (for here he was not known), and when I was done that poor toady came, with others, to give me greeting. While we have such miserable hearts as that we will never abolish Slavery (applause). Lately, I was scarcely twenty-four hours in a slave State when I heard a gentle tap at my door. A young black girl appeared, and asked, "Are you not Lucy Stone, who lectures?" I said I was; and then she told me she was a slave, and spoke of her rifled virtue, the threats to sell her babe, and all the horrors of her condition. I cannot—dare not—tell all she told me. She asked me to help her out of the State, but I had to say I could not; that the business of Abolitionists was only to make owners feel the sin of holding slaves; not to aid slaves in running away, but to persuade their masters to free them. She said, "Do you think they will do it?" and I answered, yes; and she sadly said, "I know they never will." I gave her a little money, thinking that in this land, with all its clergymen, politicians and writers, I could not do the simplest thing that Jesus commanded, when I found a person sick and in bondage, to help him. Men and women are cowards alike. Not only does the North want courage, but its moral sense is deadened and darkened. Yet I do not forget that we have men who sell their silks, but not their principles. When A. J. Coleman was offered a contract to make wagons for the Mexican war, though a poor man, he refused to accept it. We want men of that integrity which cannot be bought or sold—men who would not flatter Neptune for his trident, nor Jove for his power to thunder! Coleridge tells of an old prophet hermit, who, in time of drouth, told his countrymen that after nine days rain would come, but whoever would drink of it would go mad; it came and all drank, and were mad; then he said "it is vain to be sane when the world is mad"—plunged into the stream, and came out mad also; and so it is with the few among us where all the rest are mad! First and foremost, I would wake in the souls of the men and women of this day noble aspirations, so that they should know man does not live by bread alone; that life is earnest, real, and does not lie in the bare winning of dollars and cents, which are theirs to day, but pass away to-morrow. They must feel that life was given for a grander purpose than the selling of men and women and babes, and putting those in office who do so. But, I know so well that there is cotton in the ears of men, let us look for hope in the bosoms of women! I wish, Mr. President, that there was a child's Anti-Slavery newspaper, which, as Hamilcar led Hannibal, in his childhood, before the altar, and vowed him to eternal hatred of Rome, would take the young mind and imbue it, in the years whose impressions last during life, with eternal enmity to the accursed system of Slavery. These children will, in a quarter of a century, be the working men and women in our land, and then Slavery would be ended. The thrilling story of Uncle Tom's Cabin, of Eliza with her babe in her arms leaping from block to block of ice, was read to a child, when he cried to his mother, "Stop, I cannot hear it." She said, "We may come to a better place by and by," and went on to where Eliza and her child are safely on the bank, then the child cried, "Oh, stop now; that is a good place to stop; do not read any more" Where such a ground is laid, will that child, in twenty-five years more, own a slave or countenance Slavery? Try him with fire and you will find him true. More especially now, when the spirit of freedom is walking round the world like a god; when in China, where humanity wasted away for centuries, where men had become almost machines, the voice of God calls for freedom and is heard from the wall on one side and the water on the other; when in Europe the heart of the peoples feels deeper and stronger pulsations for liberty, it is time that we took the great lever of truth, whose fulcrum is in the hearts of the people, and apply it to this iniquitous edifice until it totters and falls. We know well that the days of Slavery are numbered; we know who sits at the helm and whose hand is on it; we know the destined end is when there shall be no aristocracy but that of humanity. In that time of the new Messiah, there shall be no dead; the souls of men will come out of their charnel-house and stand on God's platform in that better day than when the morning stars sung for joy; for we will have experiences, and regain a paradise which those experiences will not allow us to loose. Example is needed, in conformity with truth and freedom. Richter says it is the rising of the wild duck in the air which causes the flock to follow. We must have those who will rise in the atmosphere of truth and justice, and all will follow. I am gratified that here, in New York, you have remembered to forget differences of detail in view of the common end. It is a happy indication for the slave. Let us, taking the example, join hands and pledge ourselves to each other and to the slave; and though reviled, hated, misunderstood, the work we shall do will bear witness for us, and the pure, and good, and noble-hearted will rally by our side. We will take hold of the conscience of the slaveholder. The common sense of the nation will make common cause with us. Then will we give to the world what we should have long ago given, a really model republic and a nation truly Christian.—*Tribune, Jan. 25th.*

JOHN MITCHEL.

MY DEAR FRIEND: In 1848 I published several articles in my paper, *The People*, in favour of John Mitchel, and in opposition to the Government that prosecuted him. I mourned over the oppressions and wrongs of the Irish, as I still mourn; I felt indignant at their oppressors and plunderers, as I still feel. I looked on Mitchel as a friend to popular freedom, and rejoiced in his endeavours to separate Ireland from the British Empire; and when the tyrants seized him and lodged him in a prison, I risked my liberty and life in his defence. I denounced the priests, the aristocrats and princes of England, as the greatest criminals in the country, and expressed my wish, both in my lectures and my *Paper*, for their utter and eternal overthrow. I never dreamed but that Mitchel was was a friend of man, a lover of liberty universal, an advocate of right for all. I had no idea that a man who hated the tyranny of the English Monarchy and aristocracy, could favour the tyranny of an American oligarchy. It could never have entered my mind that the defender of the rights of his countrymen, could be indifferent to the rights of other men. I should as soon have expected the earth to open or the heavens to fall as have expected the repealer Mitchel to speak in favour of Slavery, or declare to the world a wish that he had a plantation stocked with slaves. I should as soon have praised the basest devil in the fabled hell of orthodoxy as knowingly eulogize an Irish republican embryo slaveholder. The filthiest and most venomous thing that crawls could not have been more hateful or loathsome to me than the loud declaimer against English tyranny, if I had known at the time that he harboured in his soul, and concealed beneath his professions of zeal for liberty, the germ, the spawn of that most heartless, infamous and execrable despotism, American slaveholding despotism.

Yet such, alas, was the case. John Mitchel, the Irish repealer and republican of 1848, was, in heart, a tyrant, a despot, a slaveholder. His professions of patriotism and love of freedom were a lie. It was power—the power to tyrannize, to plunder and to kill—that he was seeking; not freedom and the rights of man. He has published to the world his avowal that he would like to be a slaveholder. He has had the infernal hardihood to deny that slaveholding is a crime, a wrong, or even an impropriety. He has given his aid to the vilest, the most infamous band of despots on God's earth. He has opened his mouth in scorn of the noblest band of reformers and philanthropists the world can boast. He has placed himself in the most abhorred and criminal position a human being can occupy. He has uttered a more revolting manifesto than ever issued from the heart of either despot, priest or pirate. He has shown himself one of the most degraded, contemptible and hateful monstrosities that ever offended the eye, or pained the heart, or shocked the moral feelings of humanity.

It is in vain to say that four years' suffering from the hand of tyrants has corrupted him; it has only developed him. He has not degenerated, but shown himself to have been originally and radically bad. Had his heart been true to humanity, the injustice of his tyrant persecutors would only have fired his soul the more against the deeds of tyranny. If his soul had been really fired at first with the love of freedom, the smothered flames would have burst forth with double fury, scathing and blasting the tyrants and oppressors on every hand. The braggart patriot was a coward traitor. The pretended advocate of right and liberty was a secret, deadly enemy of mankind.

I withdraw the words I published in his favour. I uttered them in ignorance of his character. His tyrant persecutors I hate as heartily, and denounce as indignantly as ever; but in seizing and ejecting him, and frustrating his plots, they were, though unintentionally, doing the land of Erin and the human race a real service. They were crushing a deadly viper. They were ejecting a loathsome traitor. They were saving the Emerald Isle from sinking into a deeper hell than that into which they themselves had plunged her, and from being devoured by milder horrors than those which they themselves had let loose upon her.

Rejoice, unhappy country, that thou didst not pass from the grasp of thy open enemy into the embraces of thy pretended friend. Be glad, O Erin, that the plots of this conspirator were frustrated, and that the exile of the inhuman traitor saved thee from another bloody conflict, and another cruel mockery of thy hopes.

My friends, my former and my present readers, I have freed myself from the responsibility I took upon myself when I bespoke for the repealer Mitchel your sympathy and aid. The man who can battle with despots to-day, and to-morrow publish his wish for a southern plantation, well stocked with slaves, can have no sympathy or aid from me. My heart abhors the monster, and ejects him. Let him go. And may the curses and reproaches of the oppressed in every nation haunt him; and the righteous indignation and rebukes of every friend of right and freedom and humanity fall on him, and overwhelm him with eternal infamy.

Yours, for the oppressed and plundered of every country and of every complexion.

JOSEPH BARKER.

—*Pennsylvania Freeman.*

APPEAL

Of the Independent Democrats in Congress to the People of the United States.

SHALL SLAVERY BE PERMITTED IN NEBRASKA?

WASHINGTON, January 22, 1854.

FELLOW-CITIZENS: As senators and representatives in the Congress of the United States, it is our duty to warn our constituences whenever imminent danger menaces the freedom of our institutions or the permanency of our Union.

Such danger, as we firmly believe, now impends, and we earnestly solicit your prompt attention to it.

At the last session of Congress, a bill for the organization of the territory of Nebraska passed the House of Representatives with an overwhelming majority. That bill was based on the principle of excluding Slavery from the new territory. It was not taken up for consideration in the Senate, and consequently failed to become law.

At the present session a new Nebraska bill has been reported by the Senate Committee on Territories, which, should it unhappily receive the sanction of Congress, will open all the unorganized territory of the Union to the ingress of Slavery.

We arraign this bill as a gross violation of a sacred pledge; as a criminal betrayal of precious rights; as part and parcel of an atrocious plot to exclude from a vast unoccupied region emigrants from the Old World and free labourers from our own States, and convert it into a dreary region of despotism, inhabited by masters and slaves.

Take your maps, fellow-citizens, we entreat you, and see what country it is which this bill, gratuitously and recklessly, proposes to open to Slavery.

From the southwestern corner of Missouri pursue the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude westerly across the Arkansas, across the north fork of Canadian, to the northeastern angle of Texas; then follow the northern boundary of Texas to the western limit of New Mexico; then proceed along that western line to its northern termination; then again turn westwardly and follow the northern line of New Mexico to the crest of the Rocky Mountains; then ascend northwardly along the crest of that mountain range to the line which separates the United States from the British possessions in North America, on the 49th parallel of north latitude; then pursue your course eastwardly along that line to the White Earth river, which falls into the Missouri from the north; descend that river to its confluence with the Missouri; descend the Missouri, along the western border of Minesota, of Iowa, of Missouri, to the point, where it ceases to be a boundary line, and enters the State to which it gives its name; then continue your southward course along the western limit of that State to the point from which you set out. You have now made the circuit of the proposed territory of Nebraska. You have traversed the vast distance of more than three thousand miles. You have traced the outline of an area of four hundred and eighty-five thousand square miles; more than twelve times as great as that of Ohio.

This immense region, occupying the very heart of the North American continent, and larger, by thirty-three thousand square miles, than all the existing free States, excluding California—this immense region, well watered and fertile, through which the middle and northern routes from the Atlantic to the Pacific must pass—this immense region, embracing all the unorganized territory of the nation, except the comparatively insignificant district of Indian territory north of Red river and between Arkansas and Texas, and now for more than thirty years regarded by the common consent of the American people as consecrated to freedom, by statute and by compact—this immense region, the bill now before the Senate, without reason and without excuse, but in flagrant disregard of sound policy and sacred faith, proposes to open to Slavery.

We beg your attention, fellow-citizens, to a few historical facts.

The original settled policy of the United States, clearly indicated by the Jefferson proviso of 1784, and by the ordinance of 1787, was non-extension of Slavery.

In 1803, Louisiana was acquired by purchase from France. At that time there were some twenty-five or thirty thousand slaves in this territory, most of them within what is now the State of Louisiana; a few, only, further north, on the west bank of the Mississippi. Congress, instead of providing for the abolition of Slavery in this new territory, permitted its continuance. In 1812, the State of Louisiana was organized, and admitted into the Union with Slavery.

In 1818, six years later, the inhabitants of the territory of Missouri applied to Congress for authority to form a state constitution, and for admission into the Union. There were, at that time, in the whole territory acquired from France, outside of the State of Louisiana, not three thousand slaves.

There was no apology in the circumstances of the country for the continuance of Slavery. The original national policy was against it, and, not less, the plain language of the treaty under which the territory had been acquired from France.

It was proposed, therefore, to incorporate in the bill authorizing the formation of a state government, a proviso requiring that the constitution of the new State should contain an article providing for the abolition of existing Slavery, and prohibiting the further introduction of slaves.

This provision was vehemently and pertinaciously opposed; but finally prevailed in the House of Representatives by a decided vote. In the Senate it was rejected, and, in consequence of the disagreement between the two Houses, the bill was lost.

At the next session of Congress the controversy was renewed with increased violence. It was terminated, at length, by a compromise. Missouri was allowed to come into the Union with Slavery, but a section was inserted in the act authorizing her admission excluding Slavery, forever, from all the territory acquired from France, not included in the new State, lying north of 36 deg. 30 min.

We quote the prohibitory section:

"SEC. 8. Be it further enacted, That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, Slavery and involuntary servitude, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, shall be and is hereby forever prohibited."

The question of the constitutionality of this prohibition was submitted by President Monroe to his cabinet. John Quincy Adams was then Secretary of State; John C. Calhoun was Secretary of War; William H. Crawford was Secretary of the Treasury; and William Wirt was Attorney-General. Each of these eminent men, three of them being from slave States, gave a written opinion, affirming its constitutionality, and thereupon the act received the sanction of the President himself, also from a slave State.

Nothing is more certain in history than the fact that Missouri could not have been admitted as a slave State had not certain members from the free States been reconciled to the measure by the incorporation of this prohibition into the act of admission. Nothing is more certain than that this prohibition has been regarded and accepted by the whole country as a solemn compact against the extension of Slavery into any part of the territory acquired from France, lying north of 36 deg. 30 min., and not included in the new State of Missouri. The same act—let it be ever remembered—which authorized the formation of a constitution for the State, without a clause forbidding Slavery, consecrated, beyond question and beyond honest recall, the whole remainder of the territory to freedom and free institutions forever. For more than thirty years—during more than half the period of our national existence under our present constitution—this compact has been universally regarded and acted upon as an inviolable American law. In conformity with it, Iowa was admitted as a free State, and Minesota has been organized as a free Territory.

It is a strange and ominous fact, well calculated to awaken the worst apprehensions, and the most fearful forebodings of future calamities, that it is now deliberately purposed to repeal this prohibition, by implication or directly—the latter, certainly, the manlier way—and thus to subvert this compact, and allow Slavery in all the yet unorganized territory.

We cannot, in this address, review the various pretences under which it is attempted to cloak this monstrous wrong; but we must not altogether omit to notice one.

It is said that the territory of Nebraska sustains the same relations to Slavery as did the territory acquired from Mexico prior to 1850, and that the pro-slavery clauses of the bill are necessary to carry into effect the compromises of that year.

No assertion could be more groundless.

Three acquisitions of territory have been made by treaty. The first was from France. Out of this territory have been created the three slave States of Louisiana, Arkansas, and Missouri, and the single free State of Iowa. The controversy which arose in relation to the then unorganized portion of this territory was closed in 1820, by the Missouri act, containing the Slavery prohibition, as has been already stated. This controversy related only to territory acquired from France. The act by which it was terminated was confined, by its own express terms, to the same territory, and had no relation to any other.

The second acquisition was from Spain. Florida, the territory thus acquired, was yielded to Slavery without a struggle, and almost without a murmur.

The third was from Mexico. The controversy which arose from this acquisition is fresh in the remembrance of the American people. Out of it sprung the acts of Congress commonly known as the compromise measures of 1850, by one of which California was admitted as a free State; while two others, organizing the territories of New Mexico and Utah, exposed all the residue of the recently acquired territory to the invasion of Slavery.

These acts were never supposed to abrogate or touch the existing exclusion of Slavery from what is now called Nebraska. They applied to the territory acquired from Mexico and to that only. They were intended as a settlement of the controversy growing out of that acquisition, and of that controversy only. They must stand or fall by their own merits.

The statesmen whose powerful support carried the Utah and New Mexico acts never dreamed that their provisions would ever be applied to Nebraska. Even at the last session of Congress, Mr. Atchison, of Missouri, in a speech in favour of taking up the former Nebraska bill, on the morning of the 4th of March, 1853, said: "It is evident that the Missouri Compromise cannot be repealed. So far as that question is concerned, we might as well agree to the admission of this territory now as next year, or five or ten years hence." These words could not have fallen from this watchful guardian of Slavery had he supposed that this territory was embraced by the pro-slavery provisions of the compromise acts. This pretension had not then been set up. It is a palpable after-thought.

The compromise acts themselves refute this pretension. In the third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, it is expressly declared that "in such

State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of said Missouri compromise line, Slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be prohibited;" (*) and in the act for organising New Mexico and settling the boundary of Texas, a proviso was incorporated, on the motion of Mr. Mason, of Virginia, which distinctly preserves this prohibition, and flouts the bare-faced pretension that all the territory of the United States, whether South or North of the Missouri compromise line, is to be open to Slavery. It is as follows:

"Provided that nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything contained in the third article of the second section of the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March 1, 1845, either as regards the number of States that may hereafter be formed out of the State of Texas, or otherwise." (†)

Here is proof, beyond controversy, that the principle of the Missouri act prohibiting Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., far from being abrogated by the compromise acts, is expressly affirmed; and that the proposed repeal of this prohibition, instead of being an affirmation of the compromise acts, is a repeal of a very prominent provision of the most important act of the series. It is solemnly declared in the very compromise acts "that *nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify*" the prohibition of Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., and yet, in the face of this declaration, that sacred prohibition is said to be overthrown. Can presumption further go? To all who, in any way, lean upon these compromises, we commend this exposition.

The pretences, therefore, that the territory, covered by the positive prohibition of 1820, sustains a similar relation to Slavery with that acquired from Mexico, covered by no prohibition except that of disputed constitutional or Mexican law, and that the compromises of 1850 require the incorporation of the pro-slavery clauses of the Utah and New Mexico bill in the Nebraska act, are mere inventions, designed to cover up from public reprehension meditated bad faith. Were he living now, no one would be more forward, more eloquent, or more indignant, in his denunciation of that bad faith, than Henry Clay, the foremost champion of both compromises.

In 1820 the slave States said to the free States, "admit Missouri with Slavery, and refrain from positive exclusion south of 36 deg. 30 min., and we will join you in perpetual prohibition north of that line." The free States consented. In 1854, the slave States say to the free States, "Missouri is admitted; no prohibition of Slavery south of 36 deg. 30 min. has been attempted; we have received the full consideration of our agreement; no more is to be gained by adherence to it on our part; we, therefore, propose to cancel the compact." If this be not Punic faith, what is it? Not without the deepest dishonour and crime can the free States acquiesce in this demand.

We confess our total inability properly to delineate the character or describe the consequences of this measure. Language fails to express the sentiments of indignation and abhorrence which it inspires; and no vision, less penetrating and comprehensive than that of the All-Seeing, can reach its evil issues.

To some of its more immediate and inevitable consequences, however, we must attempt to direct your attention.

What will be the effect of this measure, should it unhappily become a law, upon the proposed Pacific railroad? We have already said that two of the principal routes, the central and the northern, traverse this territory. If Slavery be allowed there, the settlement and cultivation of the country must be greatly retarded. Inducements to the immigration of free labourers will be almost destroyed. The enhanced cost of construction, and the diminished expectation of profitable returns, will present almost insuperable obstacles to building the road at all; while, even if made, the difficulty and expense of keeping it up, in a country from which the energetic and intelligent masses will be virtually excluded, will greatly impair its usefulness and value.

From the rich lands of this large territory also, patriotic statesmen have anticipated that a free, industrious and enlightened population will extract abundant treasures of individual and public wealth. There, it has been expected, freedom-loving emigrants from Europe, and energetic and intelligent labourers of our own land, will find homes of comfort and fields of useful enterprise. If this bill shall become a law, all such expectation will turn to grievous disappointment. The blight of Slavery will cover the land. The homestead law, should Congress enact one, will be worthless there. Freemen, unless pressed by a hard and cruel necessity, will not, and should not, work beside slaves. Labour cannot be respected where any class of labourers is held in abject bondage. It is the deplorable necessity of Slavery that to make and keep a single slave, there must be slave law; and where slave law exists, labour must necessarily be degraded.

We earnestly request the enlightened conductors of newspapers printed in the German and other foreign languages to direct the attention of their readers to this important matter.

It is of immense consequence, also, to scrutinise the geographical character of this project. We beg you, fellow-citizens, to observe that it will sever the east from the west of the United States by a wide slaveholding belt of country, extending from the Gulf of Mexico to British North America. It is a bold scheme against American liberty, worthy of an accomplished architect of ruin. Texas is already slaveholding, and occupies the Gulf region from the Sabine to the Rio Grande, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Red river. North of the Red river, and extending between Texas and Arkansas, to the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min., lies the Indian territory, about equal in extent to the latter State, in which Slavery was not prohibited by the act of 1820. From 36 deg. 30 min. to the boundary line between our own country and the British possessions, stretching from west to east through more than eleven degrees of longitude, and from south to north through more than twelve degrees of latitude, extends the great territory, the fate of which is now to be determined by the American Congress. Thus you see, fellow-citizens, that the first operation of the proposed permission of Slavery in Nebraska, will be to stay the progress of the free States westward, and to cut off the free States of the Pacific from the free States of the Atlantic. It is hoped, doubtless, by compelling the whole commerce and the whole travel between the east and the west to pass for hundreds of miles through a slaveholding region, in the heart of the continent, and by the influence of a federal government controlled by the slave power, to extinguish freedom and establish Slavery in the States and territories of the Pacific, and thus permanently subjugate the whole country to the yoke of a slaveholding despotism. Shall a plot against humanity and democracy, so monstrous, and so dangerous to the interests of liberty throughout the world, be permitted to succeed?

We appeal to the people. We warn you that the dearest interests of freedom and the Union are in imminent peril. Servile demagogues may tell you that the Union can be maintained only by submitting to the demands of Slavery. We tell you that the safety of the Union can only be insured by the full recognition of the just claims of freedom and man. The Union was formed to establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty. When it fails to accomplish these ends it will be worthless, and when it becomes worthless it cannot long endure.

We entreat you to be mindful of that fundamental maxim of democracy, equal rights and exact justice for all men. Do not submit to become agents in extending legalized oppression and sytematized injustice over a vast territory yet exempt from these terrible evils.

We implore Christians and Christian ministers to interpose. Their divine religion requires them to behold in every man a brother, and to labour for the advancement and regeneration of the human race.

Whatever apologies may be offered for the toleration of Slavery in the States, none can be urged for its extension into territories where it does not exist, and where that extension involves the repeal of ancient law, and the violation of solemn compact. Let all protest, earnestly and emphatically, by correspondence, through the press, by memorials, by resolutions of public meetings and legislative bodies, and in whatever other mode may seem expedient, against this enormous crime.

For ourselves, we shall resist it by speech and vote, and with all the abilities which God has given us. Even if overcome in the impending struggle, we shall not submit. We shall go home to our constituents, erect anew the standard of freedom, and call on the people to come to the rescue of the country from the domination of Slavery. We will not despair: for the cause of human freedom is the cause of God.

S. P. CHASE, Senator from Ohio.
CHARLES SUMNER, Senator from Massachusetts.
J. R. GIDDINGS, } Representatives from Ohio.
EDWARD WADE, }
GERRIT SMITH, Representative from New York.
ALEX. DE WITT, Representative from Massachusetts.

---

[*] Act of March 1, 1845—5 U. S. Statutes at Large, 797.

[†] Congressional Globe, 1849-'50, p. 1553; Act September 9, 1850—9 U. S. Stat. at Large, 446.

From the (Manchester) Anti-Slavery Watchman.

THE MANCHESTER UNION AND THE REV. F. HEMMING.

I HAVE a painful duty to perform, and one which I should gladly avoid did not consistency to my principles, and justice to myself, and others, render its fulfilment absolutely imperative. For reasons which will hereafter be named, Mr. George Thompson, Dr. Beard, myself, and others, felt it to be our duty to oppose the election of the Rev. F. Hemming as the Agent of the newly formed Society in Manchester. We neither doubted his integrity, nor questioned his sincerity; but opposed his appointment chiefly on the ground of his views, as an Abolitionist, not being such as to render him the most suitable person to be the Agent of a Society so unsectarian in its basis as the *Manchester Anti-Slavery Union*.

The testimony of persons who have conversed with him, regarding the various Anti-Slavery parties gave rise to the suspicion that however anxious he may have been in this country to secure the support of the Abolitionists who sympathize with the American Anti-Slavery Society, of which Mr. William Lloyd Garrison is the President, yet that at home he was not only unfriendly to it, but one of its avowed opponents; and that even here he had spoken in deprecating language of the "infidel Abolitionists," and helped them to swell a foul and unjust cry against the true friends of the slave in the United States. When, therefore, a Resolution, electing him the Agent of the Manchester Union, was proposed in a recent Committee Meeting, the friends of Unsectarian Abolitionism felt it to be a duty which they were bound to perform, to vote against it. For taking this course they were attacked in a manner which I will not allow myself to describe. One individual characterized that course as a "conspiracy;" and another declared that Mr. Thompson was animated by "malignant motives," a calumny which the world will treat with the scorn, and contempt, to which it is so deservedly entitled. The minority made no personal attack—imputed no improper motives. Not a single unkind word was said of Mr. Hemming; his appointment was only looked at as it affected the Anti-Slavery cause. Towards the close of the proceedings a member of the Committee, in replying to Mr. Thompson, alluded to Mr. Garrison as the leader of the "infidel party" in the United States. Before the vote was taken Mr. Thompson asked the individual in question whether he received his information from Mr. Hemming. "No," he replied in substance, "but Mr. Hemming *confirmed* the impression I had long entertained." This fact served to strengthen the suspicion regarding that gentleman's true position in the United States, in relation to the Anti-Slavery movement.

The result of the decision was, that Mr. Hemming was elected by the casting vote of the Chairman. The following is a list of the votes—Ayes: Revs. G. Robinson (chairman), A. Gilbert, and A. Weston; Edward Westhead, Joseph Waters, and John Kirkham, Esqs.; and Messrs. Councillor Sankey, B. Chappell, and R. Wilson. Noes: the Revs. W. Parks, Dr. Beard, George Hinde, W. Stokes, and W. Whitelegge; and Messrs. G. Thompson, Nathaniel Card, and F. W. Chesson. At the next meeting of the Committee, Dr. Beard brought forward the subject for re-consideration, with a similar result however. As a statement of the reason why the minority opposed the election of Mr. Hemming will be published, it is unnecessary for me to enter fully into the subject in this place. Suffice it to say, therefore, that Mr. Thompson put the question again and again to Mr. Hemming, "Will you state your views with regard to Mr. Garrison?" and told him that he knew well the importance of the query. Mr. Hemming finally declared it to be his opinion that Mr. Garrison was an "infidel," and read an extract from the *Wesleyan* (published in Syracuse) in proof of the charge. After some further observations, to which I shall allude in proper order, he made a series of charges against myself, which I shall now proceed to consider, as the Chairman (Mr. Edward Westhead) prevented me from answering them at the time by closing the meeting immediately after Mr. Hemming had finished his speech, at the same time peremptorily refusing to put the amendment proposed by Dr. Beard.

1. Mr. Hemming stated that I had placed him in a false position before the public, by announcing him as the Agent of the American and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, both in the *Anti-Slavery Watchman* and in the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, and that he had told me that he was delegated only in an unofficial capacity, and to collect money in a "private way." In reply to this statement, I have merely to give three facts.

(1.) That if he was empowered to collect money for the American and Foreign Society at all, he was its Agent.

(2.) That I announced him as the Agent of that Society in the columns of the *Morning Advertiser* shortly after he came to Manchester, and he raised no objection to the designation then.

(3.) That before the formation of the *Union*, instead of collecting money in a "private way," he issued circulars proposing the establishment of a "Christian Anti-Slavery Mission," and delivered public lectures in Liverpool and Manchester, avowedly for the purpose of raising funds for the American and Foreign Society. If he did not actually put himself in the position of an Agent of that Society, he allowed himself to be considered as such: and I certainly could have no object in misrepresenting him.

2. He read a letter of mine which was published in the *Anti-Slavery Advocate*, for October last, and which, without the slightest cause, he chose to regard as an attack upon himself. Instead of reading the whole of the letter, he read detached passages. If necessary, I shall not shrink from reiterating what I said about the American and Foreign Society in that communication. But when Mr. Hemming tries, as he did on this occasion, by garbled quotations from my letter to prove that one reason of my opposition to his Society was occasioned by its Agents (if it has any) being men of "*acknowledged piety*," he renders himself liable to the charge of being a perverter of the truth, and a slanderer of his brother man. What I insisted upon in the *Advocate* was that there should not be any theological tests in an Anti-Slavery Society; but that any man whose life was pure, and whose Anti-Slavery principles were true, should be eligible for the office of Agent, without regard to the creed which he believed, or the sect to which he belonged. And whatever Mr. Hemming's real views may be, I do not hesitate to assert, that at one time he expressed his entire concurrence in my unsectarianism. At the last meeting he said he was willing to stand on an Anti-Slavery platform with a Pagan, even. I now publicly ask him how it is then that when he is in the United States he is not to be found in the ranks of the American Anti-Slavery Society? Supposing there are "unbelievers" in that Society, ought he not, on his own showing, to join them?

3. With great unfairness, Mr. Hemming sought to show that in the first number of the *Watchman* I had unconsciously admitted the charge of "infidelity" against the Abolitionists of the American Anti-Slavery Society. I need not waste words to explode such an absurdity. I have but to refer the reader to the second paragraph in the third column of the first number of the *Watchman*, and he will at once estimate Mr. Hemming's statement and its true value.

4. Mr. Hemming declared that the opposition to him was of a personal character—especially on my part. Of course, it is the easiest thing in the world, for him, in the absence of a better argument, to attribute improper motives to myself, or any one else. I have carefully abstained from saying anything prejudicial to Mr. Hemming as an individual. But it shall now be known that he told me a short time ago, that as he thought the *Anti-Slavery Watchman* was a very one-sided publication, he purposed calling a meeting of the subscribers of the Society together, to take its principles into consideration, with a view to determine the propriety of publishing a rival paper; that he intended to write to the *Wesleyan* (whose English correspondent I am), to state my true position; and that he considered it would be best for me to resign the office of Hon. Secretary to the *Union*, because its principles and mine were thought to be identical. I leave the reader to judge whether the Rev. Mr. Hemming has himself abstained from that personal antagonism which he so much deprecates in others.

5. Mr. Hemming tried to show that Mr. Thompson and Rev. W. Stokes were introduced into the Committee to turn him out of the Society, whereas, they were proposed without their consent having been previously obtained, and the election of the former was moved and seconded by supporters of Mr. Hemming.

6. I had intended, in this number, to reply to Mr. Hemming's charge of infidelity against Mr. Garrison, but writing as I do, very near to the day of publication, that part of the question must be postponed. The sole authority that Mr. Hemming quoted was the *Wesleyan*, with whose principles I, probably, am as well acquainted as he is. The *Wesleyan* says—"Sorry are we to know that in the transition from bigotry to liberal views, he (Mr. Garrison) has become sceptical, and infidel *to many sentiments* he once entertained in common with Evangelical Christians." How Mr. Hemming can construe this language into a charge of absolute infidelity against Mr. Garrison I cannot tell. But let the reader peruse the following extract from another leader in the same journal, and determine whether its Editor sympathizes with Mr. Hemming's cry of infidelity against Mr. Garrison.

"MR. GARRISON'S POSITION.

"The pioneer of modern Anti-Slavery, or Abolitionism, is a marked man, and a man of mark. His movements are characteristic. He has long been a representative man. Unfortunately, the type of his mental and sentimental nature is such as is found adhering to many men who have nothing of his sincerity of character, or integrity of heart. This gives advantages to those who take pleasure in maligning the cause of Freedom by abusing the men who advocate it.

"*With no sympathy for what is technically called 'infidelity' by churchmen*; on the contrary, with unwavering confidence in the Bible as a Divinely authorized and every way sufficient rule of faith and practice, *we hear much of the clamour against 'Garrison's Infidelity,' with very little sympathy for the clamourers*"

"*What there is of it that is tangible, is the fruit of their farming. Far worse, in other directions, are the results of the unmistakable Atheism of the Church respecting God, and the treachery of the Clergy in reference to the interests of humanity. Men have been placed by them in the position of baptized heathen. And sanctified robbers claim membership in the Church. They have, by their 'divinations,' bewitched the saints with their sorceries, and poisoned the streams of truth with their mixtures. The 'infidelity of Garrison' indeed!*"

Well may the Rev. Lucius Matlack say, "the infidelity of Garrison indeed!" Having been in the United States, I happen to know something of the *Wesleyans*, of whom Mr. Hemming is one, and I am acquainted with those amongst them—ministers as well as laymen—who regard the charge of infidelity against the Christ-loving Garrison as a falsehood nearly as weak, and as wicked, as that which, eighteen hundred years ago, was uttered by those who said of our Saviour—"He hath a Devil." But in the pages of this magazine, Mr. Garrison shall speak for himself; and our readers shall judge for themselves as to whether his religion is not that which was preached in the Sermon on the Mount, and which is taught on every page of the New Testament.

In closing this hastily written statement of facts I would give my hearty meed of praise to Mr. Thompson, for the admirable manner in which he defended the character, and vindicated the claims, of his absent friend, despite the insults that were heaped upon him by some of his opponents. One of them asserted, on the authority of some one else, who had just come from the United States, that "no one had done so much to rivet the chains of the Slave as George Thompson." And another gentleman, with equal good taste, made a similar statement, on the word of some unknown person who lives at Rochdale. I will not characterize the conduct of the men who spoke thus of one who had sacrificed so much and fought so bravely, and so successfully, for the cause of the slave as George Thompson, for I might have occasion to use epithets, which, however merited, I do not wish to employ. Mr. Thompson will, doubtless, defend himself before the public, if defence indeed be necessary. To Dr. Beard, also, the thanks of all Abolitionists are due. Well did he defend the cause of truth and freedom. Satisfied am I that not one of those who voted for the non-employment of Mr. Hemming will ever feel a shadow of regret for the views which they have advocated, and the course which they have pursued.

F. W. CHESSON.

Manchester, Dec. 23, 1853.

JOHN MITCHEL.

WE give place in another column to John Mitchel's defence of his peculiar notions in regard to slaves and Slavery. It is the grinding over of the old grist of pro-Slavery argumentation, which the country has enjoyed *ad nauseam* for twenty years. John Mitchel himself is very fresh in the controversy, but his arguments are very stale. To follow him in their refutation would be like breaking the bricks of an edifice already razed to its foundations. He says nothing on the general argument that has not been a hundred times said and a thousand times replied to.

Mr. Mitchel evidently feels the hateful nature of his position, and admits that it seems harsh and inconsistent for him, an exile from oppression at home, to jump at the first bound, after he touches our shores, into the ranks of the oppressors. In truth, it not only *seems* so, but it is so. It is a spectacle which shocks every true friend of liberty, and freezes the sympathy of every generous heart toward that cause of which John Mitchel has been considered a leading champion.

Never were joyful feelings so suddenly quenched; never were glowing hopes and aspirations so quickly melted into thin air, as have been those of the genuine friends of European freedom, so far as they relate to the career of the Editor of the *Citizen*. At one fatal stroke he has severed himself from every advocate of Irish emancipation in this country, whose sympathy is in the least degree vital, or at all worth having. He will soon find, if he have not already made the discovery, that a more decided act of *felo de se* was never perpetrated. Those into whose hands he has cast himself, and among whom he has chosen to take up his abode, he will find frigidly conservative. He has gone from the living to dwell among dead. His own soul will be chilled with the corpse-like contact he will everywhere experience. Does John Mitchel doubt this? If he could but speak into existence to-day another meeting of New York to sympathize with him, he would doubt no longer.

It was to have been supposed, from Mr. Mitchel's antecedents, that entering upon his American career he would have gone forward upon that broad platform of universal emancipation, whereon every true reformer and every consistent friend of liberty can alone stand. In failing to justify this anticipation, he has disclosed a radical defect in his own mind and character which is fatal to all expectation of usefulness for him in this country. He has at one step descended to a level from which his voice will never more be heard. From being one of the front men in the ranks of political progress, he has fallen to the extreme rear, if indeed he has not quite gone over to the enemy. We lament the loss of a soldier who cheered us by such promise as was his. But the loss is mainly his own. The ranks close, the procession moves on, and the void is quickly forgotten.

Mr. Mitchel has evidently never thought profoundly upon the great subjects of government or human rights. If his views of oppression had not been of the most narrow and fragmentary description, he could never have uttered himself as he has done in regard to African Slavery. If he had a broad and sympathetic nature, if he had ever considered upon what his own claims for Irish independence rested, he could not have harboured the atrocious wish he has expressed. Was it the right of himself and his confederates to rule Ireland, that he has been contending for? Did he merely desire to unhorse the Briton from the neck of his unhappy country, that he might spring into the saddle himself? Can it have been that it was because Ireland was not oppressed by *Irish* rule, that Mr. Mitchel rebelled so fiercely? It would seem so. It appears that Mr. Mitchel does not think it at all improper—nay, rather he thinks it highly laudable, to enslave a certain class of agricultural labourers. May we not fairly infer that he desired nothing better than bitter servitdde for the peasantry of his native land? And shall we not believe that he considers its poverty-doomed millions, dwelling in ignorance and misery, fit for the rule of the tyrant and the lash of the master? Such would seem to be his true position. But, whatever his acknowledgments might be on this head, it is plain that no man more unfit than he could have been found for the position of leader in a country struggling to be free. And Ireland may well cease to lament that her efforts under his leadership were vain. Even if his heart was right with respect to her emancipation, there can be no longer a doubt that his head was too feeble and shallow for so great a task. No blinder guide, judging from existing evidence, ever offered himself to lead the blind.

Mr. Mitchel introduces and scandalizes two great men of our revolution by the declaration that they occupied the same position with himself in respect to Slavery. How untrue the assumption! They found themselves in rebellion against the British Government while in possession of slaves inherited from their forefathers. But in enunciating the great doctrines of freedom for themselves, did they gloat over the bondage of their fellow-men, and prize the luxury of keeping them in chains? Did they, as John Mitchel has done, declare Slavery to be "no wrong and no peccadillo?" Did they take pleasure in the holding of slaves and desire fresh plantations of fat negroes? Shades of our revolutionary fathers answer! Where can be found more pointed and eloquent condemnation of the iniquity and evil influence of African Slavery than came from the pen of Jefferson? Did he not characterize it in language which to this day furnishes texts to every Abolitionist? And is not the testimony of the immortal Father of the country in regard to the institution clear and explicit? The evidence lies broadcast over every page of our revolutionary history, that those founders of this republic, who were Southern men themselves, deplored Slavery, deeply felt its wounding influence upon the spirit of liberty everywhere, and earnestly desired, and took measures to accomplish, its abolition. Let not John Mitchel then deceive himself, or attempt to deceive others, by pretending that he is as far advanced in his ideas of human liberty as were the hereditary slaveholders of North America three-quarters of a century ago. He cannot make good even such a pretension. And above all let him not slander such men as Jefferson and Washington by the attempt to use them for so base a purpose.

But if Mr. Mitchel can find no warrant in the authority of the hereditary slaveholders of a past age for his abominable sentiments, how is it when he contrasts himself with the revolutionists of the Northern States of that remote period? Who, among them all, ever expressed a desire for a plantation of fat negroes at the South? They had been baptised in a bloody struggle for their rights, and fully comprehended the bearings and relations of their acts. They worshipped a freedom of which John Mitchel seems to have no conception. They fought, and bled, and died, in behalf of liberty for all, and instead of preserving the institution even where it then flourished, they swept it from existence among them. It is an outrage upon our fathers, and an outrage upon history, for Mr. Mitchel to pretend that his sentiments are justified by revolutionary authority, either of the North or South. No, they are the sentiments of a debauched and corrupt modern political press, which at this day spreads its fungus existence over the great structure of our national growth. They are ideas flourishing in the feculence of political degradation—the very toad-stools of a moral night-soil, which, as they have been born and grown in an hour, will as speedily perish and disappear.

Besides, is the experience of the world and the advance of ideas, nothing, in the last three quarters of a century? Is it enough for a man who labours in the revolutionary ranks of to-day, that he can show himself to be only three-quarters of a century behind his time? Is it Mr. Mitchel's ambition to accredit himself before the world by such a showing as this? But we need not pursue the subject. We do not feel that Mr. Mitchel's position at the present moment is one to be assailed, but rather one to be commiserated and deplored.—*Tribune.*

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

Donations to the Treasury of the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, New York.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1854.

ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society was held in Boston, at the Melodeon, on Wednesday, January 25th, and by adjournment on the 26th and 27th.

The Society was called to order by FRANCIS JACKSON, the President, at 10 1-2 o'clock, A. M. of Wednesday.

The following persons were nominated and chosen a Committee to report the usual Committees, together with Assistant Secretaries of the meeting:

Daniel S. Whitney, of Southboro'; Dr. J. H. York, of Boston; E. H. Stockman, of Cummington; Alvan Howes, of Barnstable; John Jones, of Roxbury.

This Committee unanimously reported as follows:

For Business Committee—William Lloyd Garrison, Edmund Quincy, Wendell Phillips, Anne W. Weston, Andrew T. Foss, Joseph Barker, E. A. Stockman, C. L Remond, C. C. Burleigh, Henry C. Wright, Dorack Taft.

For Finance Committee—Lewis Ford, of Abington; James N. Buffum, of Lynn; Elbridge Sprague, of Abington; Reuben H. Ober, of Boston.

For Assistant Secretaries—Samuel May, Jr., of Leicester; Eliza J. Kenny, of Salem.

Their report was accepted, and the persons named duly elected.

The Treasurer of the Society being detained from the meeting on account of ill-health, his Annual Report of the Finances was read by Mr. May, one of the Secretaries; also the certificate of the Auditor, Mr. Edmund Jackson, to the correctness of the Treasurer's accounts. Receipts for 1853, including balance from preceding year, $7,803 34. Expenditures $6,948 90. Balance in Treasury, Jan. 1, 1854, $754 44; of which $350 was due, and has since been paid, to the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Voted, unanimously, that the Treasurer's report be accepted, and published with the minutes.

Opportunity for vocal or silent prayer was given by the President.

Portions of the Annual Statement of the operations of the Society were then read by Mr. May, the General Agent of the Society. The Statement included an historical view of the working of the Fugitive Slave Law, and of the Victims and Sufferers from that cruel enactment.

On motion of H. C. Wright, seconded by Joseph Barker, S. May, Jr., Wm. L. Garrison, W. Phillips, E. Quincy, and Edmund Jackson, were made a Committee upon the publication of the facts and statements collected by Mr. May, respecting the Fugitive Law.

HENRY C. WRIGHT offered three resolutions, and spoke briefly in defence of them.

JOSEPH BARKER, of Ohio, spoke eloquently of the great Sin of Slavery, and the extraordinary inconsistency of the American people in sustaining it.

MR. GARRISON read, from a Virginia paper, a ludicrously spiteful article, levelled at Massachusetts in general, and at the city of New Bedford in particular, on account of the fugitive slaves said to be residing there, and also on account of the signal failure which certain slave-hunters from Virginia had recently experienced, in an attempt to find and seize several fugitive slaves from that State, who were understood to be found, by the United States Marshal and his men, who went thither from Boston on that *honourable* (!) errand.

Adjourned to a quarter before three, P. M.

AFTERNOON.—The President in the Chair.

No resolution or business being as yet reported by the Committee, Henry C. Wright again read the resolutions offered by him in the morning. These resolutions repudiated the authority of all books, and of every being, even though called God, which justified Slavery.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., objected to the phraseology of Mr. Wright's resolutions, and expressed the hope that they might be modified, so as to avoid the introduction here of topics simply theological, and to avoid also unnecessary misunderstanding and misrepresentation of our objects, as an Anti-Slavery Society.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH also thought that Mr. Wright's resolutions were theological in their character, and liable to be misunderstood. He moved their reference to the Business Committee, with instructions to report them in a form affirming that the great Creator and Ruler of the Universe, whom we know as God, does in his very nature, and in all the manifestations he has made of himself to men, forever abhor and condemn Slavery, and all the outrages and cruelties it inflicts upon men. The motion was seconded by Mr. May, and by others, simultaneously, and the resolutions were referred accordingly, without dissent.

C. C. BURLEIGH, from the Business Committee, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, That all the signs of the time portend a strong effort, on the part of the slave power, to monopolize the functions and control the policy of the government still more eminently than in times past—in trampling under foot the Missouri Compromise, as to the Nebraska Territory—in the acquisition of fresh slave territory in the Mesilla Valley—in obtaining the sanction of the Supreme Court for the presence of slaveholders with their slaves in the free States—and in re-opening the slave trade by granting compensation to the pirates in the Amistad case.

JOSEPH BARKER briefly expressed his idea of the necessity of clear, intelligent, and correct views of the true relation of the Bible to the prevailing wrongs and crimes of the age. He did not feel sure that it was right to discuss these topics here; but, either here or elsewhere, men must discuss it, and Abolitionists especially are bound to do it.

Mr. Barker then spoke at length, and with much effect, of the various ideas entertained in different ages with regard to Slavery—of the policy and plans of American slaveholders and their allies at the present time—and of the hopeful prospects of the cause of Liberty.

C. C. BURLEIGH, in an eloquent speech, sustained the resolution he had reported.

It was announced that, at the evening sessions, the small admission-fee of five cents would be taken at the door. Adjourned to 7 o'clock, P. M.

EVENING.—The President in the Chair.

The following series of resolutions, from the Business Committee, were reported, and taken up, for discussion:

Whereas, the second number of his paper, the *Citizen*, in an article sneering at JAMES HAUGHTON, one of the most active and meritorious philanthropists of Ireland, JOHN MITCHEL, the Irish fugitive from British power, the mock rebel and self-elected champion of Irish liberty, unblushingly declares—"We deny that it is a crime, or a wrong, or even a peccadillo, to hold slaves, to buy slaves, to keep slaves to their work, by flogging or other needful coercion"—adding, "We for our part, wish we had a good plantation well-stocked with healthy negroes in Alabama"—therefore,

Resolved, That John Mitchel has revealed himself to be a braggart patriot and a thoroughly unprincipled man, utterly recreant to all his professions of liberty, a "patriotic" wolf in sheep's clothing, a slave-driver in spirit, and deserving the execrations of the friends of impartial liberty throughout the word.

Resolved, That it is fortunate for Ireland that this hollow patriot did not succeed in his supremely selfish purposes, while assuming to seek her deliverance from British misrule, and equally fortunate that he was banished as a felon to Van Dieman's land, on account of his murderous machinations; while his presence here is to be regarded as a curse to the soil on which he treads, and poison to the atmosphere which he inhales.

Resolved, That the base apostacy of John Mitchel makes the memory of the great and lamented O'CONNELL all the more dear to us, for spurning the blood-stained money which was sent from this country to the Repeal Association, to silence his voice on the subject of American Slavery, and nobly exclaiming—"I don't care for the consequences! I will not restrain my honest indignation of feeling. I pronounce every man a faithless miscreant who does not take a part for the Abolition of Slavery. Come what may, I will never countenance Slavery at home or abroad. Though it should be a blow against Ireland, it is a blow in favour of human liberty, and I will strike that blow. Let them blame me in America, let me be execrated by them—still, Slavery, I denounce you wherever you are! Come freedom, come oppression to Ireland—let Ireland be as she may—I will have my conscience clear before my God. I am bound not to look to consequences, but to justice and humanity, though the liberty of Ireland, the repeal of the Union itself, are to abide the result. Wherever tyranny exists, I am the foe of the tyrant; wherever oppression shows itself, I am the foe of the oppressor; wherever Slavery rears its head, I am the enemy of the system, or the institution, call it by what name you will. I am the friend of liberty in every clime, class, and colour—my sympathy with distress is not confined within the narrow bound of my own green island. No! It extends itself to every corner of the earth. My heart walks abroad, and wherever the miserable is to be succoured, and the slave is to be set free, there my spirit is at home, and I delight to dwell in its abode."

The floor was first taken by HENRY KEMP, of Boston, a native of Ireland. He reviewed the conduct of John Mitchel and his 'Young Ireland' friends, during the time of the Repeal contest in Ireland, and said, that for himself he had never been able to explain John Mitchel's conduct at that time in any other way than by supposing him a tool and spy of the British Government. It is no new thing, said Mr. K., to put down a popular movement in Ireland by employing so-called *patriots* as spies. And, further, said Mr. K., when I found that Mitchel, though banished by the English government to Australia, was treated on the passage thither with the greatest attention by the government officials, attended by servants, dining with the captain, and in all respects treated in a manner most unusual for a felon; and when I found him living in Van Dieman's land a life of leisure, riding about the country, and after a time so easily breaking away from his confinement and escaping to this country, I was led more than ever to suspect that the English Government winked at his movement, and that he was thus paid for services rendered. Mr. Kemp denounced John Mitchel as a traitor, in most indignant terms; he said he had long believed, and now he was sure, that there is not a more unprincipled man living than John Mitchel.

I have spoken thus here, said Mr. Kemp, because, though poverty compelled me to leave Ireland, I love her still; and because I want to do something to save her from the disgrace which such men as Mitchel, and M'Gee, and others of that school, have brought upon her. I am an Irish Abolitionist. I do not hold to freedom for myself and my countrymen, and go for the Slavery of the coloured man, or any man. And I do not believe, either, that there is anything in the nature of Irishmen to make them love Slavery and hate liberty. They are mistaught; they are deceived and prejudiced, by selfish and designing men, against the Abolitionists and their cause, and are kept away carefully from the Anti-Slavery meetings; and they are ignorant of the nature and character of the cause. Mr. K. (himself a Catholic) also spoke of their religion, as being employed as an instrument of tyranny over their minds and conduct. (Mr. K. took his seat, amidst much applause.)

JOSEPH BARKER, of Ohio (but a native of England, and only recently from that country), began with quoting John Mitchel's infamous sentiments respecting Slavery, as lately put forth by him in his new paper. He then passed to Mitchel's insulting attack upon James Haughton, of Dublin, a well-known merchant and active philanthropist of that city—a man whom John Mitchel, even in his scurrilous article, is obliged to acknowledge to be a worthy man. Mr. Haughton was a friend to Mitchel and to Meagher in Ireland, and it was very natural that he should write to them, on their arrival in this country, and express his hope that they would speak out boldly against oppression and Slavery here, as they had done in Ireland against British oppression. John Mitchel's attack upon Mr. Haughton is, therefore, mean and ungrateful, as well as wholly unwarranted by facts. For Mr. Haughton is truly worthy of respect, as a generous friend to every benevolent cause, and the charges and insinuations of Mitchel against him are calumnious and vile to the last degree. Once, said Mr. Barker, I was a friend to John Mitchel, and, through my paper, *The People*, I defended him, and advocated the movement against the English Government in which he was engaged. I am deeply sorrow now, that I ever identified myself with him; for he has shown himself a dishonest and false man. I did not then distrust his heart, nor doubt his sincerity and absolute devotion to Ireland; though I did wonder at many of his acts, which appeared to me extremely foolish. But now, I see and understand him differently; and I believe that he was a knave, and a traitor in Ireland then, as I know he is a sycophant and traitor in America now. He has disgraced his country, and, so far as he can, he has disgraced his friends. But some of his former friends will not be disgraced by him, but will speak out against every form of Slavery, all the more loudly for his recreancy. Mr. Barker closed with reading an article which he had written, and which was published in the *Pennsylvania Freeman*, on first seeing Mitchel's infamous avowal of his desire to be a slaveholder. The article has appeared in the Anti-Slavery journals generally. Though exceedingly severe and condemnatory of Mr. Mitchel, few, if any, will say it is a whit more so than the case justifies. (Mr. Barker's remarks were warmly applauded.)

WILLIAM S. BROWN, formerly of Scotland, said he arose to perform, in the words of another, 'a disagreeable duty.' I did not, he said, come to this meeting with any design to speak. But as you have been addressed, on this painful subject, first by an Irishman, and next by an Englishman, I have thought a few words from a *Scotchman* would not be ill-timed or inappropriate. I too, sir, when at home, was a friend to John Mitchel, and in a little paper which I published at Glasgow I defended him, and I justified his position, with the exception of his zealous desire for a violent and bloody struggle, and his wish to use vitriol and other like weapons against the English soldiery. For so defending him, I suffered prosecution and imprisonment. Still, however, I adhered to him, and I kept his portrait hanging in my humble dwelling, side by side with that of my Lord and Saviour. But when I read, the other day, his vile and hateful sentiments on American Slavery, I tore down his picture from my walls (bursts of applause), and I cast it from me, as I have cast forever his image from my heart (prolonged cheering).

JOHN M. CLUER, also a native of Scotland, expressed his indignant feelings against the traitor Mitchel. He adduced several facts to show the falsehood of his statements about Mr. Haughton, and the ingratitude of his heart. Mr. Cluer mentioned instances in which *coloured men* had stood, nobly and firmly, with and by John Mitchel, in his struggle against England, and had suffered banishment for it. Now, John Mitchel wants a plantation in Alabama, well stocked with the brothers of these his old friends, and faithful companions! The villain! (Applause)

HENRY KEMP said a few words to defend himself against a charge of inconsistency, in having once contributed money to aid the Young Ireland movement.

JOSEPH BARKER said that, when he spoke in praise of this country's institutions, he always excepted the treatment of the coloured people, and the infernal system of Slavery.

CHARLES LENOX REMOND, of Salem, came forward. He said it was not needful to add anything to the rebukes which had been so powerfully and eloquently administered to-night to John Mitchel. The most scorching rebuke of him came, indeed, from his own land—in every effort for freedom of her true sons, in the rich, free gifts of her daughters, to help the Anti-Slavery cause here. Mr. R. testified to the falsehood of Mitchel's charges against Mr. Haughton. And he branded the man as a *rascal*, who could come to this country, fresh from his denunciation of British tyranny, and wish *to enslave* the native-born negroes on our soil (great applause).

WENDELL PHILLIPS said he had been asked to say something about John Mitchel. But he had looked carefully about, and he couldn't see that anything was left of him. He must say that John Mitchel gave, in his own case, the strongest proof that ever had come to his knowledge, of British tyranny; for it had utterly crushed the life out of one whom it had recognised as worthy of its persecution, and had sent him to us, the poorest and meanest slave he had ever heard of (great applause).

Mr. Phillips proceeded to glance at the present fearful position of this nation; our vast unsettled territory proposed to be opened to SLAVERY; the Missouri Compromise Line designed to be swept away; the vast Mesilla valley bought to make new slave States; and Congress proposing to pay, for the Amistad negroes, a large sum of money to their lawless and piratical kidnappers! In these circumstances, where are the popular leaders? Who is asserting and defending the cause of liberty? Mr. Douglas has made his offer for the Presidency. Mr. Everett waits a while before he makes his. The Abolitionists must re-commence their labours, and do again the first works—proclaim the old first principle of their movements, and kindle anew the fires of freedom in the hearts of the people. (Mr. P.'s remarks were heard with great attention, and were warmly applauded.)

Adjourned.

THURSDAY.

Met again at the Melodeon, at 10 A.M. The President in the Chair.

The resolutions before the meeting were read by the Secretary.

J. C. CLUER hoped the question on the Mitchel resolution would not be taken now, as he desired the fullest opportunity to be given to the friends of Mr. Mitchel to speak in his defence.

The President replied that the question had not been called for, and would not probably be taken at present.

Mr. Cluer made some further remarks on the question.

REV. E. A STOCKMAN, of Cummington, Hampshire County, spoke eloquently on the general subject of Slavery. He developed with great clearness and power the pro-slavery influences which are now working upon the public mind and conscience, with a view to stifle feeling and suppress utterance. He particularly exposed the cowardly and faithless course too generally pursued by the so-called churches and ministers of the country.

SAMUEL MAY, JR., offered the following resolutions, and sustained them in a few remarks:

Resolved, That the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause present at this meeting be requested to contribute the sum of one dollar each, or such other sum as may be in their power, to defray the expenses of the Annual Meeting.

And further, Resolved, That all the members of the Society, and the friends of the Anti-Slavery cause, whether present or absent, be earnestly invoked to send to the Treasurer donations of money, or pledges to be redeemed during the year, that the Society may be enabled to continue its warfare upon all the defences of Slavery, and break up the apathy and indifference which so fearfully brood over the public mind.

WENDELL PHILLIPS spoke eloquently for a renewed and fresh consecration of time and talent to the cause.

The Finance Committee, meanwhile, proceeded to the discharge of their duties, which they afterwards, from time to time, continued during the sessions of the meeting.

DANIEL S. WHITNEY, from the Committee on Nominations, reported the following as a Committee on the Officers of the Society, for the year ensuing:

Edmund Quincy, of Dedham; William Whiting, of Concord; Richard Clap, of Dorchester; William Ashby, of Newburyport; John Clement, of Townsend; Paulina Gerry, of Stoneham; Mehetabel Haskell, of Gloucester; Joseph Merrill, of Danvers; Jacob Leonard, of East Bridgewater.

The Report was unanimously accepted, and the persons named elected said committee.

MR. GARRISON exhibited to the meeting a large handbill, printed in New Orleans, Louisiana, advertising for sale, "184 Valuable Plantation Slaves," names, ages, &c., &c., given. They are of all ages, from near 60, down to 1 1-2 years. The sale is yet to take place, viz., on the 15th of February, by the auctioneers, J. A. Beard & May. Mr. Garrison made some comments on the heart-sickening fact, in this country, of a public sale of human beings—God's immortal children.

Adjourned.

AFTERNOON.—The President in the chair.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, from the Business Committee, reported the three following resolutions, in place of those which, on Wednesday afternoon, had been referred to the Committee to appear in a new draft.

Resolved, That American Slavery is a practical denial of self-evident truths concerning the nature and rights of man, and the essence and character of God; and is therefore essentially, and under all possible circumstances, wrong.

Resolved, That every book, creed, or law, which either emanates from God or is in harmony with his will is necessarily opposed to the doctrine that chattel Slavery is right or expedient; and consequently nothing which favours that doctrine can be of divine origin, or worthy of human reverence or allegiance.

Resolved, therefore, That to affirm that the Bible sanctions Slavery, is practically to deny its divine authority, and is, moreover, to represent it as grossly inconsistent with its own fundamental principles of justice, its own great commandments of love supreme to God, and love to our neighbour as ourselves; and to affirm that the constitution and laws of the land sanction Slavery, is to affirm that they contravene the supreme law binding on all men and nations, and are therefore null and void.

HENRY C. WRIGHT presented the three following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Government of the United States, so far as it was designed by its founders to protect, propagate and perpetuate *Liberty*, has, by consecrating its energies to the protection, propagation and perpetuation of *Slavery*, utterly failed to accomplish the object for which it was designed; and it is the right and the duty of the people to change or abolish that government and establish one that shall protect all under its jurisdiction, in their inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Resolved, That should the Government succeed in its present plan to abolish the Missouri Compromise, and to throw open all the vast public domain to Slavery and the slave trade, we consider that the time has fully come for the people *practically* to assert their right of revolution, and to establish a government that shall secure to all under its jurisdiction their sacred right to freedom, and shall be, in deed and truth, an asylum for the oppressed of *all* nations.

Resolved, That the Government of the United States, in the exercise of its functions, in regard to its Foreign and Domestic relations, and the duties growing out of them, has shown a spirit hostile to liberty and in favour of Slavery; that its efforts to extend Slavery over territories where it did not exist, and its disregard to all treaties and positive enactments, in its determination to propagate and perpetuate this system of wrong and outrage, show that its great design is to establish Slavery in all the States, and to involve all the people in this crime against God and man.

REV. ANDREW T. FOSS, of Manchester, N. H., spoke with much interest and effect on the Nebraska question, &c. He traced the sad results upon the Indian, as well as upon the Negro races in this country, of the European immigration, and of what is called European *civilisation* and *religion*.

The resolutions upon pecuniary aid to the Society were called for, read again, and adopted.

William Lloyd Garrison then came forward, and was received with much warmth of feeling. We regret that we are unable to give any adequate report of his remarks. He alluded, in beginning, to the old question in Judea—Have any of the rulers believed on him? which, if answered in the negative, was sufficient to set aside the claims of Jesus. If the question were asked now, the answer would be different. All the rulers now make haste to profess a belief in Jesus; and yet, they join hands with the slaveholders, enact the Fugitive Slave Law, open new territory to Slavery, and do all in their power to "crush" the Anti-Slavery cause. Recently, there appeared in an orthodox religious journal, at Portland, edited by Rev. Dr. Cummings, an article highly laudatory of President Pierce, because he had family prayers every day, at the White House, and grace was said at his table! Yet, see his course and policy, pledging himself to maintain the Fugitive Slave Law and the Compromises with Slavery, and recommending, in his annual message, that the kidnappers of the Amistad negroes should receive compensation for the loss of their property, although the decision of our own United States Courts was that those Negroes were kidnapped from Africa, and were lawfully FREE!

Yet, said Mr. G., as we look over the world, we find the good, the true, the worthy, are on our side. These are not few in numbers, they are mighty in power, and God will yet give us the victory. Those who attended the recent Bazaar, in this city, saw a remarkable sight in the Address of the 570,000 Women of Great Britain, to the Women of America. There were recorded the names of women in every rank and situation of life, from the most affluent and distinguished down to the most lowly. Yes, here they all were, united by their common humanity and by the testimony of their common heart, against the cruel and unrighteous system of American Slavery, to offer their joint protest against its abominations. It was a noble deed; and the address is a grand and an enduring monument of the philanthropy and Christian sympathy of the women of Great Britain.

Mr. G. spoke of the slave population of our country, and of the vast addition annually made to their numbers, thereby adding just so much to the financial and political power of their oppressors. Not less than one hundred thousand are annually born into Slavery. At the market-value, these are to be reckoned at not less than fifty dollars each; making an annual addition in these fresh victims, of five millions of dollars to the wealth and power of the slaveholders.

And what is doing on the other side? I read, said he, within a few days, that a single church and congregation in this city (Rev. E. N. Kirk's) had subscribed over $4,000 for the year, in the cause of *Foreign Missions*, and it was said that the amount would undoubtedly be raised to $6,000. Six thousand dollars in one congregation, in a single year, for the conversion of the heathen abroad! But ask this church and congregation to contribute for preaching the Gospel to three and a half millions of slaves *at home*, the greater part of whom are in a "heathen condition" (so testified by Southern religious bodies), and what would they give? Not Six Cents.

What did the American Anti-Slavery Society receive last year? Only about six or seven thousand dollars for all its operations, to sustain all its agents, and to sustain, also, its organ, the *National Anti-Slavery Standard*. And of this sum, a considerable proportion was furnished by the contributions of friends abroad, through the Bazaar.

Mr. G. then spoke of the terrible and traitorous blow which has just been struck against the cause of liberty by John Mitchel.

Mr. Haughton, said Mr. G., needs no commendation from us. As a gentleman, he is one of the model men of Europe—as a lover of his country, ever devoted and active—as a friend of his race, ready to every good word and work. It is an infamous allegation that he, being a corn-merchant, has speculated in the sufferings and needs of his countrymen. It is a false and libellous charge. And John Mitchel would have us believe that Jesus Christ himself would have held slaves, and coveted a slave plantation, had he dwelt in America. Mr. G. referred to Daniel O'Connell, and his declaration that he would never come to this country so long as Slavery continued. But I rejoice, said he, that John Mitchel has come out so plainly, and at once. We now know the man, and nobody will be deceived by his cant about liberty.

A voice in the Gallery—"Thank God, the Irish are not all John Mitchels." This was said in an unmistakable Irish accent, and elicited much applause.

And yet, said Mr. Garrison, is John Mitchel a sinner above all men? What more has he said than Bishop Hedding of the Methodist Episcopal Church said, when he defended Slavery as in accordance with the Golden Rule? Wherein is he worse than Moses Stuart of Andover, and all others who have defended or are defending Slavery as in accordance with the word and will of God?

Mr. Garrison's speech produced a very deep impression. Adjourned.

Evening.—The President in the Chair.

G. W. F. Mellen obtained the floor, and read some resolutions, which were not seconded.

The meeting was addresed, at this session, by Wm. L. Garrison, Joseph Barker, and Wendell Phillips. A phonographic report was taken of their remarks, and they will be published at length in due time.

Adjourned to Friday.

FRIDAY.

Re-assembled at the Melodeon. President in the Chair.

The resolutions before the Society were again read.

G. W. Putnam, of Lynn, took the floor. He alluded to some remarks about himself in the *Liberator*, and said that for twenty years he had never faltered in his Anti-Slavery course, though he had continually suffered on that account. Mr. P. went on to express his disagreement with some of the views advanced, the evening previous, by Messrs. Garrison and Phillips. He denied that there could be any genuine Anti-Slavery or philanthropy in the nobility and aristocracy of England, inasmuch as they were themselves the grievous oppressors of their fellow-men.

J. C. Cluer replied to Mr. Putnam, pointing out several erroneous assumptions of his, and showing the vast difference between any foreign oppression and American Slavery.

William H. Fish, of Hopedale, addressed the meeting in an earnest and excellent speech, showing some of the principal hindrances and difficulties in the way of the progress of Anti-Slavery, but evincing still an unshaken faith in its certain triumph over them all.

Rev. Hiram Wilson, of St. Catherine's, Canada West, offered the following resolutions:

Resolved, That Hell from beneath is moved to meet all tyrants at their coming, whether American or transatlantic; and that while we pity the crushed victims of Slavery and oppression, and would do everything in our power for their speedy deliverance, in accordance with the golden rule and the law of love given by the great Redeemer of Mankind, we cherish unmingled abhorrence, but no malevolent feeling, towards the tyrant and the slaveholder, and regard true Abolitionists of every land as their only faithful friends, who fain would save them from the awful doom that awaits them.

Resolved, That the numerous and rapidly increasing coloured population of Canada have given, and are now affording, full and convincing proofs that they are eminently deserving the blessed boon of freedom for which they struggled in the midst of difficulties and dangers seldom if ever experienced by any people, and that it is pleasingly evident that those who have escaped from Southern yokes, and whips, and branding-irons, and patrols, are not incompetent to "take care of themselves."

Mr. Wilson supported these resolutions in some interesting remarks, in the course of which he related the cases of several persons who had escaped from Slavery, and were now living in Canada. They had abundantly vindicated their ability to take care of themselves and their families, and to command the respect and confidence of those about them. Adjourned.

Afternoon.—President in the Chair.

Wm L. Garrison, from the Business Committee, reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, That this Society feels the highest pleasure in learning that **George Thompson**, of England, the early, incorruptible, eloquent and powerfully efficient advocate of the slave, is once more publicly in the field, at home, and actively consecrating his time and talents to the glorious work of concentrating and directing the entire public sentiment (and especially the religious influence) of England against the satanic slave system in America; and we beg him to assure every audience whom he may be permitted to address, every religious body with whom he may be in correspondence, and every friend of humanity with whom he may come in contact, that no testimony borne by them against our great national sin can possibly do any injury, but it will greatly encourage and strengthen the friends, and dishearten the foes, of negro emancipation on our soil.

Whereas, It is the declared purpose of the present national administration to exclude from every official station under the government every man who refuses to support "the Compromise Measures of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave Law," or to wear a padlock on his lips in regard to the subject of Slavery, thus wielding the terrible power of the government for the enlargement and perpetuation of the Slave Power, and the "crushing out" of the Anti-Slavery spirit universally; therefore

Resolved, That **Franklin Pierce** is guilty of high treason against the cause of liberty—of trampling under foot the provisions of the Constitution, and making it more than ever the guardian and bulwark of a form of despotism too revolting to be tolerated on the soil of Europe; and, therefore, he is to be impeached and branded as the vilest of all the tyrants who now curse the nations of the earth—and as one upon whom Pius Ninth of Italy, and Francis Joseph of Austria, and Nicholas of Russia, may look down with scorn and derision.

Resolved, That usurpation so daring and profligate as this should cause all party lines to be obliterated, until the administration is made to sink under the weight of popular indignation, and the Slave Power is driven out of existence.

Wendell Phillips spoke, showing, by numerous proofs, the work which the Anti-Slavery agitation has accomplished in the country, and particularly upon Southern opinion and action. He then spoke of the infamous purpose of the administration, and of certain aspiring Northern politicians, to destroy the Missouri Compromise, by way of propitiating the favour and gaining the support of slaveholders. He next alluded to the misrepresentation of him, by one of the speakers in the morning, in saying that he *praised the institutions of England*. He had done no such thing. All he had said was, that England was far better than the United States. And that was saying absolutely nothing. But this he would say, that the Statute-book of England has, for years, been steadily rising higher in the scale of justice and humanity, becoming more and more free from unequal and oppressive enactments and severe penalties; while that of the United States has been as certainly and steadily growing more and more odious. And when we make such a comparison, we are to remember the wide difference in the situation and circumstances of the two nations—the one, old, hemmed in by narrow limits and crowded with a dense population, crippled by the effects of former misrule, and burdened with enormous debts—the other, young, fresh, free from debt, with a vast unsettled territory of great fertility, waiting to be occupied and tilled by tens of millions of people. When these things are taken into the account, as in honesty they should be, we cannot fail to be still more impressed with the advance made in England in the science of government, and in regard for the well-being of the people. Indeed, the tyranny of the worst despotisms of the Old World becomes light in the comparison with American Slavery.

Mr. Garrison spoke in support of the resolutions on the National Administration.

Rev. Theodore Parker addressed the meeting in a speech of some length, prepared with evident care, and delivered with much effect. [We hope that Mr. Parker may write out this speech for publication; meanwhile, we take, in part, from the *Commonwealth*, the following sketch of it.]

"Rev. Theodore Parker spoke for nearly an hour and a half upon the present aspect and position of the slave power in America. He referred to this power as regards its territorial extent, comparing its former circumscribed limits with its present extended area. The unoccupied territory was to be the battle-ground upon which would be contested the subject of Slavery, in Congress, at this session. Every church has its symbolical books; every State has also its books or Constitution. Russia has none, but its book is the Czar. American churches worship the unacknowledged god—Mammon. Many of our ministers, with the Bible before them, inaugurate the worship of Mammon. The principle of the Whig party was to put money before man—the principle of the Democratic party was to put the majority before the instinctive right of man.

"Allusion was made to the Inaugural address of President Pierce, in which he declared his purpose to carry out the principles of the Missouri Compromise. The Constitution has several times been violated by the slaveholding power. The Bible Society will not distribute its Bibles among the slave population. The Tract Society looks over its publications, and strikes out everything opposed to Slavery. In the North, there is an effort to-day to get rid of Slavery. There are those who are earnestly labouring, but the Free Soil party is not on its feet, but on its back. It has not lost its legs, but has slipped and fallen. Yet its heart is sound, and it will yet rise up again and stand. Allusion was made to the delegation of the Anti-Slavery party in Congress. He paid a just and worthy compliment to Messrs. Sumner and Chase, for their efforts in the Senate, and Messrs Smith and Giddings of the House. A touching tribute was paid to the memory of Robert Rantoul, Jr. He enumerated several favourable indications in the South, which, at present, promised much good to the cause of freedom. Several names were mentioned of men who are fishing for the Presidency, among whom were Cass, Douglas, Everett, Lawrence, Foote and Davis; and he said that after we had Polk, Fillmore and Pierce, there is nobody so low but that they can aspire. Allusion was made to Bedini, the Pope's nuncio, who, he said, came here with his hand red with his brother's blood, and two eminent Senators had made an attempt to wash it white as snow."

Adjourned.

Evening.—The President in the Chair.

Edmund Quincy, from the Committee on that subject, reported the following for Officers of the Society during the ensuing year:

President.—Francis Jackson, Boston.

Vice-Presidents.—Andrew Robeson, New Bedford; Edmund Quincy, Dedham; Adin Ballou, Milford; John M. Fisk, West Brookfield; Joshua T. Everett, Princeton; Effingham L. Capron, Worcester; Jefferson Church, Springfield; Oliver Gardner, Nantucket; Henry I. Bowditch, Boston; Josiah Henshaw, West Brookfield; Caroline Weston, Weymouth; Benjamin Snow, Jr., Fitchburgh; George Miles, Westminster; James N. Buffum, Lynn; Cyrus Pierce, Newton; John T. Hilton, Brighton; Thomas T. Stone, Bolton; Bourne Spooner, Plymouth; William Ashby, Newburyport; John Bailey, Lynn; Charles F. Hovey, Boston; John S. Safford, Cummington; James Russell Lowell, Cambridge; Richard Clap, Dorchester; William Whiting, Concord; A. A. Bent, Gardner; Ezekiel Thatcher, Barnstable; David P. Harmon, Haverhill.

Corresponding Secretary.—Samuel May, Jr., Leicester.

Recording Secretary.—Robert F. Wallcut, Boston.

Treasurer.—Samuel Philbrick, Brookline.

Auditor.—Edmund Jackson, Boston.

Counsellors.—William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, John Rogers, Anne W. Weston, John M Spear, William I. Bowditch, Edmund Quincy, Maria Weston Chapman, Cornelius Bramhall, Eliza Lee Follen, Charles K. Whipple, John T. Sargent.

The report was unanimously accepted: and the persons therein named elected officers for the year ensuing.

Charles C. Burleigh read the first three resolutions before the meeting, and spoke very ably in their support.

Frederick Douglass being called for by several voices in the audience, came to the platform, and made a few remarks on the resolutions read by Mr. Burleigh, and some other topics.

Edmund Quincy spoke, chiefly to the rescinding of the Missouri Compromise. He traced the policy, and successive triumphs, of the Slave Power with great ability; and predicted the complete success, for the time, of all their schemes, unless the Northern people shook off their apathy, acquired some manliness of spirit, and showed a determined resistance to this desperate, yet really in themselves feeble band of slaveholders.

Jerome B. Taft, formerly of McGrawville College, addressed the meeting in a brief but spirited speech.

Mr. Garrison, from the Business Committee, introduced the following resolution:

Whereas, our faithful and beloved coadjutor, **Parker Pillsbury**, after many years of arduous and unremitted labours in the Anti-Slavery cause, as an Agent both of the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies, to the prostration of his health, so that he has deemed it expedient to take a voyage to Europe for its restoration; therefore,

Resolved, That we warmly commend him to the generous hospitality, fraternal confidence and earnest co-operation of the friends of negro-emancipation in particular, and the cause of freedom universally, wherever he may travel abroad; that our best wishes, mingled with the blessings of "those who are ready to perish," go with him; and that we trust he will, in due time, be restored to his family and friends, to his colabourers and the field of conflict with the Slave Power, with his bodily health fully restored, and his heart greatly strengthened, to enter afresh into the work of "undoing the heavy burdens, breaking every yoke, and letting the oppressed go free."

In a very clear and affecting speech, **Mr. Garrison** asserted and defended the rights of the enslaved population of the land, and denounced their wicked and cruel oppressors.

A stranger in the audience arose to complain of what Mr. Garrison had said of the churches and ministers of the North. He knew a great many ministers, who were thoroughly Anti-Slavery, and prepared to work for the overthrow of Slavery.

Mr. Garrison replied, Who has said that there are no Anti-Slavery ministers and churches! No one. We know, and rejoice to know, there are such; but we also know, that there are very few. They are the exceptions, who will always take care of themselves, and who will vindicate sufficiently their own position and character. And if the numerous ministers, of whom the gentleman has spoken, are so Anti-Slavery, and so willing to work in this cause, why do we not see some of them here to-day.

Charles L. Remond said that, feeling quite unwell, this afternoon, he had gone home to Salem. But when he arrived there, he felt worse, and so he came back again! He rejoiced to have one more opportunity to lift up his voice, in Boston, to protest against the infamous system of slaveholding at the South, and the equally infamous spirit of negro-hate at the North. He referred particularly to the recently-published statement that Mr. William Appleton, Representative from Boston in Congress, had made a large donation to the Colonization Society, to assist in sending eighty coloured persons to Liberia. Mr. Remond denounced the act, as one of negro-proscription and hatred, and as showing Mr. Appleton to be an enemy to the coloured people. Mr. Remond spoke with very great warmth, and with true eloquence, and was loudly applauded.

The hour being late, **Mr. Garrison** moved the adoption of several resolutions which had been reported to the meeting, and repeatedly read. The motion was seconded by many voices, and being put to the meeting were unanimously adopted.

The society then adjourned, *sine die*.

FRANCIS JACKSON, President.

Samuel May, Jr., } Assistant Secretaries.
Eliza J. Kenny, }

MISSOURI COMPROMISE MEETING

A crowded meeting, composed for the most part of the partisans of the Compromise of 1850, assembled at the Tabernacle, on Monday evening last, to protest against the passage of Douglas's Nebraska Bill, which proposes to set aside the solemn compact of 1820, whereby Slavery was forever prohibited in that part of the territory formerly known under the name of Louisiana which lies west of the Mississippi and north of the parallel of 36 deg. 30 min. **Shepherd Knapp**, Treasurer of the Castle Garden Union and Safety Committee, was appointed Chairman. The other officers were, for the most part, Silver Grays or Hunkers of the most incorrigible sort. An assembly of such men, gathered for the purpose of protesting against the encroachments of the Slave Power, was a strange sight, provocative of queer reminiscences and suggesting odd reflections. "Saul among the prophets" was a most natural and expected phenomenon when compared with the spectacle presented by these infatuated Union-savers of 1850 adjusting their mouths for the utterance of a testimony in favour of freedom! It must be confessed that their awkwardness betrayed a lack of experience in this sort of public business. The question, in their hands, assumed a merely commercial aspect. It was not the crime of Slavery, nor yet the evils of its extension over a vast territory, that excited their indignation. With them it was a simple question of adhering to or repudiating a *bargain* between the North and South; and the highest moral principle avowed by the speakers did not rise above that level. A bargain to *extend* Slavery would have been just as sacred in their eyes as one to *prevent* its extension. "*A bargain's a bargain*" was the only moral axiom to which they appealed. To have gone farther would have been to place themselves in dangerous proximity to the "Higher Law," which of course would have been a violation of all the precepts of the gospel according to St. Hunker and St. Badamus! Nevertheless, the assembly was a most significant sign of the times—a sign, not to be mistaken, of the power of the Anti Slavery Sentiment of the North; for what else but that sentiment could have galvanized such men to action? If they had succeeded in their efforts to stop Anti-Slavery Agitation by the Compromise of 1850, the whole North would have sunk into a lethargy so profound that neither Douglas's bill nor any other measure providing for the extension of Slavery could have awakened them. They owe it to the persistent fidelity of the Abolitionists that their base treachery in 1850 did not sink them beyond the possibility of repentance and resurrection.

Robert Emmett, Esq., Judge of the Superior Court, addressed the meeting at length, presenting a historical view of the whole subject, and showing clearly that Douglas's bill is a fraud. He closed by offering the following

RESOLUTIONS.

1. Resolved, That the City of New York, from the formation of the Federal Union to the present time, has always been foremost in maintaining the constitutional rights of the Southern portion of this Confederacy; that she has ever been, and still is firmly devoted to the tranquility, welfare, honour, and permanence of the Union; and that in view, not simply of her past and present fidelity to all constitutional obligations, but of her well-known regard for the true interests and well being of the South, she has a right to expect whenever occasion shall arrive for a protest, on her part, against a threatened infringment of ancient rights, long since secured by solemn compact to the people of the North, that that protest will be listened to with respectful attention, both by the Government and the people, and especially by the Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled from the Southern States.

2. Resolved, That in our opinion, such an occasion has arisen from the presentation in both Houses of Congress of propositions to supersede, abrogate and declare inoperative, the 8th section of the act of Congress, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise, in these words:

"Sec. 8. Be it further enacted, That in all the territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. of north latitude, now inclosed within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, Slavery and involuntary servitude otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, of which the party shall have been duly convicted, shall be forever prohibited."

3. Resolved, That it is an undisputed matter of history, fresh in the memories of our older citizens, recorded in the annals of our country, and familiarly known to the younger generation, that the original settled policy of this nation, as declared by Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Hamilton, Jay, King, and the framers of the Constitution generally, was against the extension of Slavery beyond the States wherein it originally existed; that when the Missouri Territory, formed out of the large tract purchased from France, applied for admission to the Union, in 1818, with a constitution sanctioning Slavery, the North, speaking by its representatives, sternly refused their assent unless the system should be prohibited; that in New York the opposition was deep seated and decided, and was exhibited at a meeting of more than 2,000 citizens, at the City Hotel, on the 17th November, 1819, presided over by General Matthew Clarkson, at which it was resolved, "that in their opinion the admission of Slavery "into any State or Territory thereafter to be formed "and admitted to the Union would be contrary to the "spirit of our free and excellent Constitution, and in-"jurious to the highest interests of the nation;" that at the next session of Congress, to quiet the controversy that raged throughout the country, Henry Clay, of Kentucky, himself a slaveholder, proposed and strenuously urged the compromise embodied in the section above recited, which was acceded to by certain Northern representatives, and reluctantly acquiesced in by their constituents. That the constitutionality of that prohibition was, at the time, submitted by President Monroe to his Cabinet, of which John Quincy Adams, John C. Calhoun, Wm. H. Crawford and Wm. Wirt, were members, and by them affirmed, and that compromise offered and urged by the South and accepted by the North as the condition of the admission of Missouri has ever since been regarded by the American people as a firm inviolable compact, consecrating forever and without recall all the said territory north of 36 deg. and 30 min. to an identity of feeling and interest with the free States.

4. Resolved, That the section of country, thus forever released, and quit claimed to the free States for a consideration approved, received and acknowledged by the slaveholding States, constitutes an all-important part of our northern territory, stretching from west to east, through more than eleven degrees of longitude, and from south to north, through more than twelve degrees of latitude, embracing an immense and fertile region occupying the heart of our continent, larger far than all the existing free States, excluding California, and more than ten and a half times as great as New York, and that if this great territory were now to be snatched from our rightful control and re-appropriated by the South, for the establishment therein of Slavery, it would inevitably retard the progress of our western emigration, and cut off the free States and Territories on the Atlantic from those on the Pacific.

5. Resolved, That in regard to the pretense set forth in the amendment proposed to the bill now pending before the Senate, "to organize the territory of Nebraska," that the 8th section of the act preparatory to the admission of Missouri which forever prohibited Slavery north of 36 deg. and 30 min., was suspended by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, and is therefore and thereby to be declared inoperative, we reply:

First, That an express compact, made in 1820, in reference to certain territory acquired from France, cannot be suspended by the principles of any legislative acts passed thirty years later, having reference exclusively to other territory acquired from Mexico.

Secondly, That it was never intimated nor supposed in 1850, that the act then passed would at all disturb the Missouri Compromise.

Thirdly, That the provision in the Texas Boundary bill of 1850, originally introduced as an amendment by Senator Mason, of Virginia, distinctly re-affirmed and consecrated the principle of the prohibition of Slavery north of 36 deg. and 30 min., which had been incorporated into the joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States passed in 1845, and that for these reasons the proposed repeal of the Missouri Compromise, in order to extend Slavery over an immense northern territory from which it is now excluded by solemn compact, so far from being in accordance with the Compromise acts of 1850, would be an express violation of their avowed spirit and intent: re-opening for general discussion the merits and demerits of Slavery, social, political and moral, and reviving in tenfold intensity the very agitation that the friends of those compromise measures professedly desired to suppress.

6. Resolved, That whatever other results might follow the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, it would inevitably impair the confidence of the North in the integrity and honour of the South; that it would destroy all faith in the permanency of past or future compromises, having any bearing on the subject of Slavery, and thus materially weaken our national bonds of union.

7. Resolved, That we call upon the Legislature of the State, and upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to resist unflinchingly, in such manner as they shall deem meet, all attempts, from whatsoever quarter, to repeal, abrogate or render inoperative, directly or indirectly, the eighth section of the Missouri Act; and that we call upon the President of the United States, in case of the passage of such a bill by Congress, to secure that compact from violation by interposing his constitutional veto.

8. Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the presiding officer of each branch of our State Legislature and to the Senators and Representatives of the State of New York in Congress, for presentation to those bodies, to the Governor of each State of the Union, and to the President of the United States.

James W. Gerard (the mover of the Castle Garden resolutions in 1850), seconded the resolutions in a speech of much ability and force. Avowing himself in favour of the Compromise of 1850, Fugitive Slave bill and all, he took the ground that Douglas's bill was a flagrant violation of a solemn compact—an outrage upon the North and an impeachment of the honour of the South. He illustrated his idea of the relative obligation of the two sections, the North and South, to keep faith with each other on the Slavery question, most felicitously, as it seemed to us, by a reference to law of "honour among thieves." There was one part of his speech that created a marked sensation, and, coming as it did from a rabid Union-saver, may possibly have some weight with the South. Here it is.

Now to the South I would speak in friendship, and by way of caution. This is a an awful subject. No man can doubt that it is the subject of subjects; for it is that which is spreading the agitation throughout the land. I therefore would bid the South, while I profess to be its friend, to take care. I would advise it to be cautious. The North was hard to bring to accept the Compromise of 1850. The Fugitive Slave Law was gilded as well as it could be. But for all that it was a bitter pill for the North to swallow. I helped to gild that pill (cheers and laughter). I hold in my hand a speech which I delivered in Castle Garden for the purpose of recommending the Compromise, and carrying out the Fugitive Slave Law. I was then the friend of the South, and I am still so. The North has redeemed the pledge which Castle Garden had given for the execution of that law. New York, her merchants, her mechanics and her citizens at large, have redeemed that pledge. But still it must be admitted that there was a reluctance on the part of New York. It was, in fact, like the slumbering of a lion. We who were and are the friends of the Union, had to stroke down the lion's mane; we had to magnetize him to keep him quiet. We had to give him chloroform (cheers) to quiet his rising energies. The lion of the North still slumbers and still sleeps. The South has not yet heard its roar, and I will say, Help me, Heaven, to do all in my power still to maintain the Compromise of the North and the South, whereby the banner of the Union shall stand unfurled, firm, and forever. But I tell politicians they are playing with edged tools. They are playing with a tool which cuts both ways—and I tell them to take care that they are not cut down by their own weapons. While my friends—not that I speak with threats—with my sentiments, I cannot but speak in a voice of warning and friendship; now let the South mark and hear me, and let the Reporters put down what I say, and let it go from the South to the North, from one ocean to the other, that if the Compromise can be trifled with, what becomes of the Compromise of 1850? (applause). If they are cobwebs that are spun to be broken, if they are toys that are made to be dashed to the ground, if the Compromise of 1820 is a dead letter, what becomes of the Compromise of the Constitution? What becomes of the Compromise of 1850? It is a solemn inquiry. Well may every reflecting man pause, while I address them on that subject. Look ahead. We extend over a mighty territory. There are parties in our land who take hold of every principle that they can drag in, out of which to make political capital. They are your politicians, and if there is a race of men whom I detest to the bottom of my heart, it is the trading politicians (applause). There they are, watching and envying the peace of the land; and if they cannot go into power on a smooth road they will raise a whirlwind and ride into power, even if that whirlwind should desolate half the country. Now, I tell the South to beware. The politicians are seeking to inveigle them into a trap. They are casting a bait whereby to catch their votes; but take care that bait is not poisoned, and when they take it it may not destroy them. I tell the South that we are their friends—that the City of New York are emphatically their friends, and we call upon them for justice. We do not threaten—we only say, beware; and then if they will not mind our warning voice we have done our duty (great applause). As I said, it is not the South that made this claim. I will watch their debates. To morrow's mail will bring, perhaps, the detail of the debate to-day, and then let us see whether Southern politicians—men of high honour and high principle—take the ground that the Compromise shall be repealed, and above all, watch if they take the ground because it is unconstitutional.

At the close of Mr. Gerard's speech the resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Among the letters addressed to the committee of arrangements and forming a part of the proceedings were the following:

From Hon. Wm. H. Seward, of New York.

Washington, Saturday, Jan. 28, 1854.

Gentlemen: The invitation to a meeting to be held in the City of New York, to protest against any repeal or violation of the Missouri Compromise, with which you have honoured me, has been received. My constant attendance here is required by the interest which the City of New York and the State of New York have in the great projects of a Railroad to San Francisco, and the extension of our commerce to the islands and continents divided from us by the Pacific Ocean, which are now being matured in committees to which I belong. Moreover, the day designated for the meeting is one upon which the Senate may be brought to a vote upon the bold and dangerous measure which has so justly excited the patriotic apprehensions of the citizens of the metropolis. I could not be safely absent from the capital under these circumstances, even if my attendance in New York would otherwise be proper.

You have kindly asked me, in view of this inability, to give you such an expression of my "sentiments as may help to arouse the North to the defence of its rights, and the South to the maintenance of its plighted honour." Permit me to say, in response to the appeal, that when the Slavery laws of 1850 were under discussion in the Senate, I regarded the ground then demanded to be conceded by the North as a vantage ground, which, when once yielded, would be retrieved with infinite difficulty afterwards, if, indeed, it should not be absolutely irretrievable; and that I, therefore, in my place as a representative here, said and did all that it was in my power to do and say, and all that I could now do and say, to "help to rouse the North to the defence of its rights, and the South to the maintenance of its honour." When, afterwards, eminent members of Congress, who had been engaged in passing those laws, carried an appeal against those who had opposed them before the people in their primary assemblies, I declined to follow them then, and I have ever since refrained from all unnecessary discussions of the slave law of 1850, and of matters pertaining to Slavery, even here, as well as elsewhere, because I was unwilling to injure so just a cause by discussions which might seem to betray undue solicitude, if not a spirit of faction. We have only now arrived at a new stage in the trial of that appeal. For it is quite clear that if the Slavery laws had not been passed in 1850 for the territories acquired from Mexico, there would have been no pretence for extending such Slavery laws now over the territories before acquired from Louisiana, and that if we had maintained our ground on the laws of freedom, which then protected New Mexico and Utah, we should not now have been attacked in our stronghold in Nebraska. It is equally evident, also, that Nebraska is not all that is to be saved or lost. If we are driven from this field, there will yet remain Oregon and Minnesota, and we who thought, only so lately as 1849, of securing some portion at least of the shore of the Gulf of Mexico and all of the Pacific coast to the institutions of freedom, will be, before 1859, brought to a doubtful struggle to prevent the extension of Slavery to the shores of the great Lakes, and thence westward to Puget's Sound. I hope, gentlemen, that for one I may be allowed to continue to the end that abstinence from popular agitation which I have heretofore practiced, less from considerations of self-respect than from my confidence in the sagacity and virtue of the people I represent. Nevertheless, I beg you to be assured that, while declining to go into popular assemblages, as an agitator, I shall endeavour to do my duty here with as many true men as shall be found in a delegation which, if all were firm and united in the maintenance of public right and justice, would be able to control the decision of this great question. But the measure of success and effect which shall crown our exertions must depend now, as heretofore, on the fidelity with which the people whom we represent shall adhere to the policy and principles which are the foundation of their own unrivalled prosperity and greatness.

I am, gentlemen, with great respect and esteem, your obedient servant,

William H. Seward.

From Senator Chase, of Ohio.

Washington, January 26, 1854.

Gentlemen: I have to acknowledge the honour of your invitation to attend a public meeting in New York, to protest against the repeal of the Slavery prohibition embodied in the Missouri act of 1820.

Out of all the territories acquired by treaty, or annexed by Congress, since the organization of our federal government, but two free States—Iowa and California—have been created; while out of the same territory no less than five slave States—Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas—have been organized. The Missouri act, conceding to the slave interest the admission of Missouri, with Slavery, provided, by common consent, for the exclusion of Slavery from all the residue of territory north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes. It is said, sometimes, that this prohibition was the work of Northern men, and that the slave interest is not bound by it. This pretext is without foundation. The prohibition, as it now stands in the statute, was moved by Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, on the 3d of February, 1820, as an amendment to the Missouri bill, which had been tacked by the Senate to the bill for the admission of Maine. It was ageeed to on the 17th, *ayes* 34, *noes* 10, by the following vote:

Ayes—Morrill and Parrot of New Hampshire; Mellen and Otis of Massachusetts; Dana and Lanman of Connecticut; Burrill and Hunter of Rhode Island; Palmer and Tichenor of Vermont; King and Sanford of New York; Dickerson and Wilson of New Jersey; Lowrie and Roberts of Pennsylvania; Ruggles and Trimble of Ohio; Horsey and Van Dyke of Delaware; Lloyd and Pinkney of Maryland; Stokes of North Carolina; Johnson and Logan of Kentucky; Eaton and Williams of Tennessee; Brown and Johnson of Louisiana; Leake of Mississippi; King and Walker of Alabama; Edwards and Thomas of Illinois.

Noes—Noble and Taylor of Indiana; Barbour and Pleasants of Virginia; Macon of North Carolina; Gaillard and Smith of South Carolina; Elliott and Walker of Georgia; Williams of Mississippi.

It will be seen that *fourteen* Senators from slave States voted for Mr. Thomas's amendment, and *twenty* Senators from free States, while eight from the former voted against it, with two from the latter.

When a separate bill for the admission of Missouri came up from the House, it was amended in the Senate, by striking out the clause requiring a provision in her constitution prohibiting Slavery, and by inserting Mr. Thomas's amendment, without debate—the sense of Senators having been fully ascertained by former votes.

It is therefore perfectly clear that, so far as the Senate is concerned, where the slave States are, and always have been strongest, the South joined with the North in the prohibition.

In the House, the final vote on concurring in the amendment for striking out the restriction on Slavery in the State was ayes 90, nays 87. After this vote had been taken, it was certain that Missouri was to be admitted as a slave State, and the only remaining question was, shall Slavery be prohibited in the residue of the territory north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes? The vote on concurring in this prohibition was, yeas 134, nays 42. Of the yeas, *thirty-eight* were from slave and *ninety-six* from free States. Of the nays, *thirty-seven* were from slave States, and *five* from free.

It is clear, from the above statement, that in the Senate a large majority of Southern men voted for the prohibition—among them Mr. King, of Alabama, recently Vice-President of the United States. With these voted the few Northern consenters to the admission of Missouri with Slavery, as well as those who insisted on a clause in her constitution forbidding Slavery, as a condition of admission.

In the House, a number of slaveholders, for an obvious reason proportionally less, sustained the prohibition. Among them was Lowndes, of South Carolina, whose vote, estimated by the worth and honour of the man, outweighs many opposites.

It is absolutely certain that, without the prohibition clause, Missouri with Slavery could never have been admitted. The admission was the consideration of the clause, and the clause the consideration of the admission. Taken together they constituted a compact, not absolutely inviolable, indeed—for any compact may be violated—but not to be broken without dishonour. "It is true," said Mr. Niles, in his *Register*, at the time, "the compromise is supported only by the letter of a law respectable by the authority which enacted it; *but the circumstances of this case give to this law* A MORAL FORCE *equal to that of a* POSITIVE PROVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION; *and we do not hazard anything in saying that the* CONSTITUTION EXISTS IN ITS OBSERVANCE."

But I am making this reply too long. I desired only to show that the Missouri prohibition has every attribute of a solemn compact; and that the proposition to repeal it now, after one side has had all the advantages ever expected from it, is as discreditable to its proposers and supporters as acquiescence in it, or submission to it, would be dishonourable to the men of the free States. I think I have accomplished this. Having done so, I leave the other manifold and vastly important economical and political considerations which belong to the subject to other and abler hands.

For myself, I have long been satisfied that the safety of the country and the honour of the States demand not merely prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, but its denationalization, by which term I understand the separation of the general government from all connection with it and all responsibility for it, and its absolute restriction to the States by the laws of which it may be tolerated.

Regretting that I cannot be with you in person, and earnestly invoking for your patriotic movement the blessing and guidance of that Divine Being who led our fathers through the hazards and trials of the Revolution, I remain, with great respect, your fellow-citizen,

S. P. Chase.

From Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York.

Washington, Friday, Jan. 27, 1854.

Gentlemen: I have received your invitation to attend a public meeting of citizens of New York, without distinction of party, called to protest against the repeal or violation of the Missouri compromise, which prohibits Slavery in that portion of the territory acquired from France which is north of 36 deg. 30 min., and is not included within the State of Missouri. The day named for your meeting has been assigned for the consideration in the Senate of the United States of the bill which proposes to abrogate the solemn compact which, more than the third of a century since, restored quiet and mutual confidence to distracted and estranged portions of the confederacy. While I sympathize entirely with your desire to maintain inviolate the compromises which have been made in relation to the vexed question of Slavery, I cannot be with you. Duty requires that I remain here to vote against any and every measure which proposes or looks to a repeal or negation of the binding obligation of the Missouri compromise. The compromise of 1820 is not inconsistent with that of 1850. On the contrary, the recognition of the existence of Slavery from territory north of 36 deg. 30 min. of north latitude is in express terms preserved and maintained in one of the laws of 1850, known as the "Compromise measures." The repeal or the negation of the Missouri compromise would therefore be a violation of faith twice pledged. I am, gentlemen, with great respect, your obedient servant,

Hamilton Fish.

THE NEBRASKA QUESTION.

Senator Douglas opened the debate upon this question, on Monday last, in a furious and denunciatory tirade against Senator Chase and his Free Soil associates in Congress for presuming to send forth the Address to the People which will be found in another part of this sheet. Mr. Chase met the insolence of the 'Little Giant' in a spirit of manly firmness worthy of himself and the cause he represents. Mr. Sumner also spoke briefly in answer to certain imputations of the Senator from Illinois. On Tuesday the subject came up again, but was postponed till Friday, by request of Mr. Chase, who expressed his intention to give his views at considerable length. Other Senators will doubtless follow him. The subject has also been introduced to the House, and the country may now prepare itself for an agitation that will be a singular commentary upon the doctrine of Finality of which we have heard so much for the last few years. There are different opinions as to the probable result of the struggle, but we expect to witness another triumph of the Slave Power. The President is pledged for Douglas's bill, and he will doubtless be able, by a skilful distribution of official favours, to buy just enough Northern votes to effect his purpose.

Anti-Slavery Lectures in Boston.—We understand that a Course of Anti-Slavery Lectures will soon be commenced in Boston, and that the Rev. Lyman Beecher, D. D., Rev. Calvin E. Stow, D. D., Rev. Edward Beecher, D. D., Hon. Horace Greeley, Rev. H. W. Beecher, Hon. J. G. Palfrey, Rev. A. L. Stone (of the Park street Church, Boston), and Rev. R. S. Storrs, Jr., of Brooklyn, are among those who are expected to take part in it. We reveal no secret, we believe, in saying that to Mrs. Stowe belongs the credit of originating this course of Lectures in the Pilgrim city. It was her desire that William Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips should be among the lecturers, but the unwillingness of some of the clerical gentlemen above named to stand in such a relation to those devoted friends of the cause compelled her to assent to their exclusion. We regret this, not on account of the slight put upon our friends—for they are too noble to care for it on any personal grounds—but as the sign of a narrowness and sectarian prejudice on the part of the clerical gentlemen themselves, which, we fear, will impair the force of their own testimony against Slavery. No man can be qualified for high service in the cause of Freedom until he has learned that that cause transcends all sectarian distinctions. But while we say this, we rejoice with all our hearts that some of the eminent clergyman of Boston and vicinity are about to give an emphatic testimony against the monster sin of the nation. We will forgive all their past shortcomings, and put the most generous construction upon their anti-Christian exclusiveness that the case admits of, if they will only speak earnest, truthful and unequivocal words for the slave. We do not ask them to utter our shibboleths, but we *do* beg them to be true to their own highest convictions and to the claims of those whose wrongs have so long cried to Heaven for redress. Once let the flame of God's impartial and boundless love be fairly kindled in their souls, and they will speedily become willing to labour side by side with anybody who desires to help forward the Anti-Slavery work.

Crowded.—We are compelled to pospone considerable matter for which we greatly desired to find room the present week, and to forbear noticing several topics that urgently invite attention. Our columns are too scanty for such times as these.

Asa Davis, a warm-hearted and intelligent Abolitionist, and a contributor, within the last few years, of more than $2,000 to the Western Anti-Slavery Society, died at Burlington, Iowa, Jan. 2d. The *Bugle* says: "Mr. Davis was one of the few who daily made the cause of the poor his own, and who felt and acted as though all that he was and all that he possessed should be used for the benefit of humanity. Actively conscientious, he came out from the church when it became false to truth and to justice; for the like reason, he refused his support to the Government, and boldly identified himself with the right, however unpopular and at whatever cost." The departure of such men from the labours of earth to the more exalted labours of the life to come should operate as an incentive to their friends to follow their example of fidelity, patience and devotion to the right.

The *Independent Herald* is a new paper which has just been started at West Chester, Pa., by H. Boske. It is an excellent family newspaper, independent of political parties, reformatory in its spirit and progressive in its aims. The editor evidently understands his business, and we cannot doubt that among the intelligent and wide-awake people of Chester County he will find abundant encouragement in his new enterprise.

Horace Greeley delivered the Eighth Lecture of the New York Anti-Slavery Society's Course, at the Tabernacle, on Tuesday evening. We have space enough only to permit us to say, that the discourse was not inferior to any that preceded it for breadth of view, earnestness of tone, lucidity of statement, or logical power and skill. It commanded the close attention of a large audience, whose gratification was expressed at the close in a spontaneous request that it might be published. We hope the request may be speedily complied with.

—The next lecture will be given by Rev. W. H. Furness. Subject: "The Destined Ascendancy of Northern Ideas."

Likenesses of Isaac T. Hopper.—The beautiful Plaster Medallion Likenesses of the lamented Hopper, which have been so much admired by all who have seen them, may now be obtained at the Anti-Slavery Office Price $2. Having had many inquiries for them within the last few months, we are glad to inform all concerned that they may now obtain copies.

MUCH IN LITTLE.

To William Goodell has been awarded the prize of $100 offered by the church of Lahina, Sandwich Islands, to the author of the best essay on the subject, "*American Slavery a formidable obstacle to the Conversion of the World.*" Rev. G. W. Perkins, Rev. J. W. C. Pennington, D.D., and Hon. William Jay, were appointed judges to award the prize. Six essays were submitted to their examination, and the last two gentlemen concurred in the above award.

——A correspondent of the *Tribune*, writing from New Bedford, Mass., tells a story which shows what perils slaves will sometimes encounter in the hope of obtaining liberty:

The coloured population of New Bedford is very large, numbering not less than 1,000. Very many are fugitives from "Southern *service*." Riding out a few days since, I passed an erect, intelligent-looking negro, trimming the street lamps. I asked Canada, the negro who was driving, who he was. "Oh!" he replied, "he has been here only a year, from Virginia. He is a brother in the same church I am." I inquired how he escaped. Canada continued, "Well, he was in *a box* several days, and once at sea he came pretty fast. His wife had given him up, though she had waited years. Liberty is sweet, and the first time he came into church I thought he would set it on fire. I tell you he *blowed there!*" The allusion to a whaling phrase is significant. A fugitive could not be taken here, it is believed.

——The *Messenger*, a publication of the American Tract Society, having proclaimed that "the whole country and every family and neighbourhood in it is open to religious effort, and may be reached by Christian effort," with more of the same sort, "A New England Pastor," in the *Independent*, ironically exclaims:

"Now look for a tract on the sins of slave-breeding and slave-trading, or the wickedness of denying legal protection to female chastity and the marriage relation. No longer are the sins of Slavery to be taxed with the labour of *seeking and inferring their own destruction* from an *unproclaimed and unenforced* Gospel, while all other sins against God or man have this labour done for them gratuitously.

No longer must infidelity fatten on the disgrace of our American catholic evangelical Christianity as represented by the Tract Society, in virtually confessing that one gigantic family of sins is too rich, powerful, or formidable to be even *named with the slightest accent of rebuke*. Now that there is 'full and practical religious freedom' 'in every neighbourhood' of our favoured country, may we not hope that the sins of Slavery will no longer be exempt from the censures so fully bestowed upon dancing, gambling, intemperance, profanity, Popery, and every other form of iniquity? And when Rosa Madiai, and other pupils from the school of oppression, come to 'our school of freedom,' of which the *American Messenger* speaks with so much gratitude, may we not hope that Rosa Douglas will have graduated, that the two Rosas may flourish and bloom together in 'full religious freedom?' Will the *Messenger* inform the public when the anti-Bible law condemning Christian women to prison for teaching children to read God's Word was revoked, and when and how 'full religious freedom was practically carried' into Norfolk Virginia?"

——The prevalence of humanitary ideas in quarters where formerly Christianity was made to wear a stern, unsympathizing, dogmatic aspect, is one of the most cheering signs of the times. Nothing, indeed, could be more encouraging than such indications that men are beginning to see that "pure religion and undefiled" does not consist in an orthodox creed, but in a life unselfishly devoted to humanity, a spirit which sees a child of God, sublime in capability and immortal in destiny, even in the lowest and most degraded criminal. How strikingly is this spirit manifested in the following paragraph from a well-known correspondent of the *Independent*, whose life is the exemplification of his words:

"Desperate men have often redeeming excellencies of great brilliancy. Thieves and robbers by profession have a kind of honesty, sometimes, in their opinions and ways of thinking, that timid and conservative religionists lack. And men of crime and reckless character, that have broken law, lost caste, sunk out of good society, and set at defiance God and man, are not always the worst men in the world after all. They may be worth saving, worth redeeming. There be many noble natures in wreck and ruin, that might be got off, and righted, and restored. And God is a being who cares about all such persons. And if it cannot be done in any other way; if those '*hard cases*,' those abandoned desperadoes will not come near the means of restoration, God will drive out some good man of commanding genius, able to win ascendancy even over such reprobate natures—will drive him out by stress of bad fortune, disgrace, or calamity, and make him a sacrifice for their sins, as it were, giving him for the companion and leader of the very wretches he would save."

——We often read, with a painful interest, amounting almost to agony, the reports of the noble men who are devoting themselves to labours of charity and mercy among the outcast poor of this great city. Of all the efforts now being made in this field, those which look to the salvation of children from the vice and degradation in the midst of which they are placed seem to us most hopeful. 'C. R. B.' (known to be Charles R. Brace, Secretary of the Children's Aid Society) often gives, through the press, intensely interesting accounts of what he sees and hears in his 'Walks among the New York Poor.' In the *Times* of the 27th ult., speaking of a visit to a dark, damp, filthy cellar, the abode of a family of six or eight persons—the parents squalid, idle, intemperate, shiftless—he makes these remarks, which show how well he understands the work in which he is engaged:

Yet it is cheering—it cheered me even in that squalid hole—that the children are so much superior to the parents. It needs time for vice, and beggary, and filth to degrade childhood. God has given every fresh human soul something which rises above its low surroundings, and which even Want and Vice do not at once wear away. For the old poor, for the sensual who have steeped themselves in crime, for the drunkard, the thief, the prostitute who have run a long course, let those heroically work who will. Yet, noble as is the effort, one's experience of human nature is obliged to confess the fruits will be very few. The old heart of man is a hard thing to change. In any comprehensive view the only hopeful reform through society must begin with *childhood*—basing itself on a change of circumstances and on religious influences.

Our especial plan in these Industrial Schools is to apply these two influences; to reach the moral sense of the child, and to put her out of temptation, either by sending her out of the City or by teaching her something which will be a means of honest support afterward. No Reform is worthy, every sensible mind will admit, unless it goes to the springs of action. But the great means must be through the change of circumstances.

Miscellaneous Department.

THE SCHOOLBOY'S STORY.

BY CHARLES DICKENS.

Being rather young at present—I am getting on in years, but still I am rather young—I have no particular adventures of my own to fall back upon. It would n't much interest anybody here, I suppose, to know what a screw the Reverend is, or what a griffin *she* is, or how they do stick it into parents—particularly hair-cutting and medical attendance. One of our fellows was charged in his half's account twelve and six-pence for two pills—tolerably profitable at six and three-pence a piece, I should think—and he never took them either, but put them up the sleeve of his jacket.

As to the beef, it's shameful. It's *not* beef. Regular beef is n't veins. You can chew regular beef. Besides which there's gravy to regular beef, and you never see a drop to ours. Another of our fellows went home ill, and heard the family doctor tell his father that he could n't account for his complaint unless it was the beer, and well it might be!

However, beef and Old Cheeseman are two different things. So is beer. It was Old Cheeseman I meant to tell about; not the manner in which our fellows got their constitutions destroyed for the sake of profit.

Why, look at the pie-crust alone. There's no flakiness in it. It's solid—like damp lead. Then our fellows get nightmares, and are bolstered for calling out and waking other fellows. Who can wonder!

Old Cheeseman one night walked in his sleep, put his hat on over his night-cap, got hold of a fishing-rod and a cricket-bat, and went down into the parlour, where they naturally thought from his appearance that he was a Ghost. Why, he never would have done that if his meals had been wholesome. When we all begin to walk in our sleeps, I suppose they'll be sorry for it.

Old Cheeseman was n't second Latin Master then; he was a fellow himself. He was first brought there, very small, in a post-chaise, by a woman who was always taking snuff and shaking him—and that was the most he remembered about it. He never went home for the holidays. His accounts (he never learnt any extras) were sent to a Bank, and the Bank paid them; and he had a brown suit twice a year, and went into boots at twelve. They were always too big for him, too.

In the midsummer holidays, some of our fellows who lived within walking distance, used to come back and climb the trees outside the playground wall, on purpose to see Old Cheeseman residing there by himself. He was always as mild as the tea—and *that's* pretty mild, I should hope!—so when they whistled to him, he looked up and nodded; and when they said "Holloa, Old Cheeseman, what have you had for dinner?" he said "Boiled mutton;" and when they said "An't it solitary, Old Cheeseman?" he said "It is a little dull, sometimes;" and then they said "Well, good bye, Old Cheeseman!" and climbed down again. Of course it was imposing on Old Cheeseman to give him nothing but boiled mutton through a whole Vacation, but that was just like the system. When they did n't give him boiled mutton they gave him rice pudding, pretending it was a treat. And saved the butcher.

So Old Cheeseman went on. The holidays brought him into other trouble besides the loneliness; because when the fellows began to come back, not wanting to, he was always glad to see them: which was aggravating when they were not at all glad to see him, so he got his head knocked against walls, and that was the way his nose bled. But he was a favourite in general. Once, a subscription was raised for him; and, to keep up his spirits, he was presented before the holidays with two white mice, a rabbit, a pigeon, and a beautiful puppy. Old Cheeseman cried about it, especially soon afterwards, when they all ate one another.

Of course Old Cheeseman used to be called by the names of all sorts of cheeses, Double Glo'sterman, Family Cheshireman, Dutchman, North Wiltshireman, and all that. But he never minded it. And I don't mean to say he was old in point of years, because he was n't, only he was called, from the first, Old Cheeseman.

At last, Old Cheeseman was made second Latin Master. He was brought in one morning at the beginning of a new half, and presented to the school in that capacity as "Mr. Cheeseman." Then our fellows all agreed that Old Cheeseman was a spy, and a deserter, who had gone over to the enemy's camp, and sold himself for gold. It was no excuse for him that he had sold himself for very little gold—two pound ten a quarter, and his washing, as was reported. It was decided by a Parliament, which sat about it, that Old Cheeseman's mercenary motives could alone be taken into account, and that he had "coined our blood for drachmas." The Parliament took the expression out of the scene between Brutus and Cassius.

When it was settled in this strong way that Old Cheeseman was a tremendous traitor, who had wormed himself into our fellows' secrets on purpose to get himself into favour by giving up everything he knew, all courageous fellows were invited to come forward and enrol themselves in a Society for making a set against him. The President of the Society was First boy, named Bob Tarter. His father was in the West Indies, and he owned, himself, that his father was worth Millions. He had great power among our fellows, and he wrote a parody, beginning,

> "Who could believe to be so meek
> That we could hardly hear him speak,
> Yet turned out an Informing Sneak?
> Old Cheeseman."

—and on in that way through more than a dozen verses, which he used to go and sing, every morning, close by the new master's desk. He trained one of the low boys too, a rosy cheeked little Brass who did n't care what he did, to go up to him with his Latin Grammar one morning, and say it so: *Nominativus pronominum*—Old Cheeseman, *raro exprimitur*—was never suspected, *nisi distinctionis*—of being an informer, *aut emphasis gratia*—until he proved one. *Ut*—for instance, *Vos damnastis*—when he sold the boys, *Quasi*—as though, *dicat*—he should say, *Pretærea nemo*—I'm a Judas! All this produced a great effect on Old Cheeseman. He had never had much hair; but what he had, began to get thinner and thinner every day. He grew paler and more worn; and sometimes of an evening he was seen sitting at his desk with a precious long snuff to his candle, and his hands before his face, crying. But no member of the Society could pity him, if he felt inclined, because the President said it was old Cheeseman's conscience.

So Old Cheeseman went on, and didn't he lead a miserable life! Of course the Reverend turned up his nose at him, and of course *she* did—because both of them always do at all the masters, but he suffered from the fellows most, and he suffered from them constantly. He never told about it, that the Society could find out; but he got no credit for that, because the President said it was Old Cheeseman's cowardice.

He had only one friend in the world, and that one was almost as powerless as he was, for it was only Jane. Jane was a sort of wardrobe-woman to our fellows, and took care of the boxes. She come at first, I believe, as a kind of apprentice, some of our fellows say from a Charity, but *I* don't know, and after her time was out, had stopped at so much a year. So little a year, perhaps I ought to say, for it is far more likely. However, she had put some pounds in the Savings' Bank, and she was a very nice young woman. She was not quite pretty; but she had a very frank, honest, bright face, and all our fellows were fond of her. She was uncommonly neat and cheerful, and uncommonly comfortable and kind. And if anything was the matter with a fellow's mother, he always went and showed the letter to Jane.

Jane was Old Cheeseman's friend. The more the Society went against him the more Jane stood by him. She used to give him a good-humoured look out of her still-room window, sometimes, that seemed to set him up for the day. She used to pass out of the orchard and the kitchen-garden (always kept locked, I believe you!) through the play-ground, when she might have gone the other way, only to give a turn of her head, as much as to say "Keep up your spirits!" to Old Cheeseman. His slip of a room was so fresh and orderly, that it was well known who looked after it while he was at his desk; and when our fellows saw a smoking hot dumpling on his plate at dinner, they knew with indignation who had sent it up.

Under these circumstances, the Society resolved, after a quantity of meeting and debating, that Jane should be requested to cut Old Cheeseman dead: and that if she refused, she must be sent to Coventry herself. So a deputation, headed by the President, was appointed to wait on Jane, and inform her of the vote the Society had been under the painful necessity of passing. She was very much respected for all her good qualities, and there was a story of her having once waylaid the Reverend in his own study and got a fellow off from severe punishment, of her own kind comfortable heart. So the deputation didn't much like the job. However, they went up, and the President told Jane all about it. Upon which Jane turned very red, burst into tears, informed the President and the deputation, in a way not at all her usual way, that they were a parcel of malicious young savages, and turned the whole respected body out of the room. Consequently it was entered in the Society's book (kept in astronomical cypher for fear of detection), that all communication with Jane was interdicted; and the President addressed the members on this convincing instance of Old Cheeseman's undermining.

But Jane was as true to old Cheeseman as Old Cheeseman was false to our fellows—in their opinion at all events—and steadily continued to be his only friend. It was a great exasperation to the Society, because Jane was as much a loss to them as she was a gain to him; and being more inveterate against him than ever, they treated him worse than ever. At last one morning, his desk stood empty, his room was peeped into and found to be vacant, and a whisper went about among the pale faces of our fellows that Old Cheeseman, unable to bear it any longer, had got up early and drowned himself.

The mysterious looks of the other masters after breakfast, and the evident fact that Old Cheeseman was not expected, confirmed the Society in this opinion. Some began to discuss whether the President was liable to hanging or only transportation for life, and the President's face showed a great anxiety to know which. However, he said that a jury of his countrymen should find him game; and that in his address he should put it to them to lay their hands upon their hearts, and say whether they as Britons, approved of Informers, and how they thought they would like it themselves. Some of the Society considered that he had better run away until he found a Forest where he might change clothes with a woodcutter, and stain his face with blackberries; but the majority believed that if he stood his ground, his father—belonging, as he did, to the West Indies, and being worth millions—could buy him off.

All our fellows' hearts beat fast when the Reverend came in, and made a sort of a Roman, or a Field Marshal of himself with the ruler; as he always did before delivering an address. But their fears were nothing to their astonishment when he came out with the story that Old Cheeseman, "so long our respected friend and fellow-pilgrim in the pleasant plains of knowledge," he called him—O yes! I dare-say! Much of that! was the orphan child of a disinherited young lady who had married against her father's wish, and whose young husband had died, and who had died of sorrow herself, and whose unfortunate baby (Old Cheeseman) had been brought up at the cost of a grandfather who would never consent to see it, baby, boy, or man; which grandfather was now dead, and serves him right—that's *my* putting in—and which grandfather's large property, there being no will, was now, and all of a sudden and for ever, Old Cheeseman's! Our so long respected friend and fellow-pilgrim in the pleasant plains of knowledge, the Reverend wound up a lot of bothering quotations by saying, would "come among us once more" that day fortnight, when he desired to take leave of us himself in a more particular manner. With these words, he stared severely round at our fellows, and went solemnly out.

There was precious consternation among the members of the Society now. Lots of them wanted to resign, and lots more began to try to make out that they had never belonged to it. However, the President stuck up, and said that they must stand or fall together, and that if a breach was made it should be over his body—which was meant to encourage the Society: but it didn't. The President further said, he would consider the position in which they stood, and would give them his best opinion and advice in a few days. This was eagerly looked for, as he knew a good deal of the world on account of his father's being in the West Indies.

After days and days of hard thinking, and drawing armies all over his slate, the President called our fellows together, and made the matter clear. He said it was plain that when Old Cheeseman came on the appointed day, his first revenge would be to impeach the Society, and have it flogged all round. After witnessing with joy the torture of his enemies, and gloating over the cries which agony would extort from them, the probability was that he would invite the Reverend, on pretence of conversation, into a private room—say the parlour into which parents were shown, where the two great globes were which were never used—and would there reproach him with the various frauds and oppressions he had endured at his hands. At the close of his observations, he would make a signal to a Prize-fighter concealed in the passage, who would then appear and pitch into the Reverend till he was left insensible. Old Cheeseman would then make Jane a present of from five to ten pounds, and would leave the establishment in fiendish triumph.

The President explained that against the parlour part, or the Jane part, of these arrangements he had nothing to say; but, on the part of the Society, he had counselled deadly resistance. With this view he recommended that all available desks should be filled with stones, and that the first word of the complaint should be the signal to every fellow to let fly at Old Cheeseman. The bold advice put the Society in better spirits, and was unanimously taken. A post about Old Cheeseman's size was put up in the playground, and all our fellows practised at it till it was dented all over.

When the day came, and places were called, every fellow sat down in a tremble. There had been much discussing and disputing as to how Old Cheeseman would come; but it was the general opinion that he would appear in a triumphal car drawn by four horses, with two livery servants in front, and the Prize-fighter in disguise up behind. So all our fellows sat listening for the sound of wheels. But no wheels were heard, for Old Cheeseman walked after all, and came into the school without any preparation. Pretty much as he used to be, only dressed in black.

"Gentlemen," said the Reverend, presenting him, "our so long respected friend and fellow-pilgrim in the pleasant plains of knowledge, is desirous to offer a word or two. Attention, gentlemen, one and all!"

Every fellow stole his hand into his desk, and looked at the President. The President was all ready, and taking aim at Old Cheeseman with his own eyes.

What did Old Cheeseman then, but walk up to his old desk, look round him with a queer smile as if there was a tear in his eye, and begin in a quavering mild voice, "My dear companions and old friends!"

Every fellow's hand came out of his desk, and the President suddenly began to cry.

"My dear companions and old friends," said Old Cheeseman, "you have heard of my good fortune. I have passed so many years under this roof—my entire life so far, I may say—that I hope you have been glad to hear of it for my sake. I could never enjoy it without exchanging congratulations with you. If we have ever misunderstood one another at all, pray, my dear boys, let us forgive and forget. I have a great tenderness for you, and I am sure you return it. I want, in the fulness of a grateful heart, to shake hands with you every one. I have come back to do it, if you please, my dear boys."

Since the President had begun to cry, several other fellows had broken out here and there: but now, when Old Cheeseman began with him as first boy, laid his left hand affectionately on his shoulder and gave him his right; and when the President said "Indeed I don't deserve it, Sir; upon my honour I don't;" there was sobbing and crying all over the school. Every other fellow said he didn't deserve it, much in the same way; but Old Cheeseman, not minding that a bit, went cheerfully round to every boy, and wound up with every master—finishing off with the Reverend last.

Then a snivelling little chap in a corner, who was always under some punishment or other, set up a shrill cry of "Success to Old Cheeseman! Hoorray!" The Reverend glared upon him, and said "*Mr.* Cheeseman, Sir." But, Old Cheeseman protesting that he liked his old name a great deal better than his new one, all our fellows took up the cry; and, for I don't know how many minutes, there was such a thundering of feet and hands, and such a roaring of Old Cheeseman, as never was heard.

After that, there was a spread in the dining room of the most magnificent kind. Fowls, tongues, preserves, fruits, confectionaries, jellies, neguses, barley-sugar temples, trifles, crackers—eat all you can and pocket what you like—all at Old Cheeseman's expense. After that, speeches, whole holiday, double and treble sets of all manners of games, donkeys, pony-chaises and drive yourself, dinner for all the masters at the Seven Bells (twenty pounds a-head our fellows estimated it at), an annual holiday and feast fixed for that day every year, and another on Old Cheeseman's birth-day—Reverend bound down before the fellows to allow it, so that he could never back out—all at Old Cheeseman's expense.

And didn't our fellows go down in a body and cheer outside the Seven Bells? O no!

But there's something else besides. Don't look at the next story-teller, for there's more yet. Next day, it was resolved that the Society should make it up with Jane, and then be dissolved. What do you think of Jane being gone, though! "What? Gone for ever?" said our fellows with long faces. "Yes, to be sure," was all the answer they could get. None of the people about the house would say anything more. At length, the first boy took upon himself to ask the Reverend whether our old friend Jane was really gone? The Reverend (he has got a daughter at home—turn-up nose, and red) replied severely, "Yes, sir, Miss Pitt is gone." The idea of calling Jane Miss Pitt! Some said she had been sent away in disgrace for taking money from Old Cheeseman; others said she had gone into Old Cheeseman's service at a rise of ten pounds a year. All that our fellows knew was, she was gone.

It was two or three months afterwards, when, one afternoon, an open carriage stopped at the cricket-field, just outside bounds, with a lady and gentleman in it, who looked at the game a long time and stood up to see it played. Nobody thought much about them, until the same little snivelling chap came in, against all rules, from the post where he was Scout, and said, "It's Jane!" Both Elevens forgot the game directly, and run crowding round the carriage. It *was* Jane! In such a bonnet! And if you'll believe me, Jane was married to Old Cheeseman.

It soon became quite a regular thing when our fellows were hard at it in the play-ground, to see a carriage at the low part of the wall where it joins the high part, and a lady and gentleman standing up in it, looking over. The gentleman was always Old Cheeseman, and the lady was always Jane.

The first time I ever saw them, I saw them in that way. There had been a good many changes among our fellows then, and it had turned out that Bob Tartar's father wasn't worth millions! He wasn't worth anything. Bob had gone for a soldier, and Old Cheeseman had purchased his discharge. But that's not the carriage. The carriage stopped, and all our fellows stopped as soon as it was seen.

"So you have never sent me to Coventry after all!" said the lady laughing, as our fellows swarmed up the wall to shake hands with her. "Are you never going to do it?"

"Never! never! never!" on all sides.

I didn't understand what she meant then, but of course I do now. I was very much pleased with her face though, and with her good way, and I couldn't help looking at her—and at him too—with all our fellows clustering so joyfully about them.

They soon took notice of me as a new boy, so I thought I might as well swarm up the wall myself, and shake hands with them as the rest did. I was quite as glad to see them as the rest were, and was quite as familiar with them in a moment.

"Only a fortnight now," said Old Cheeseman, "to the holidays. Who stops? Anybody?"

A good many fingers pointed at me, and a good many voices cried, "He does!" For it was the year when you were all away, and rather low I was about it, I can tell you.

"Oh!" said Old Cheesman. "But it's solitary here in the holiday time. He had better come to us."

So I went to their delightful house, and was as happy as I could possibly be. They understood how to conduct themselves towards boys, *they* do. When they take a boy to the play, for instance, they *do* take him. They don't go in after it's begun, or come out before it's over. They know how to bring a boy up, too. Look at their own! Though he is verry little as yet, what a capital boy he is! Why, my next favourite to Mrs. Cheesman, and Old Cheeseman, is young Cheeseman.

So, now I have told you all I know about Old Cheeseman. And it's not much after all, I am afraid. Is it?—*Household Words.*

THE BIRTH OF THE YEAR.

BY FREDERICK TENNYSON.

Let us speak low, the Infant is asleep,
The frosty hills grow sharp, the day is near,
And Phosper with his taper comes to peep
Into the cradle of the new-born year;
Hush! the infant is asleep;
Monarch of the Day and Night,
Whisper, yet it is not light,
The infant is asleep.

Those arms shall crush great serpents ere to-morrow,
His closed eyes shall wake to laugh and weep;
His lips shall curl with mirth, and writhe with sorrow,
And charm up Truth and Beauty from the deep;
Softly, softly, let us keep
Our vigils! visions cross his rest,
Prophetic pulses stir his breast,
Although he be asleep.

Now Life and Death arm'd in his presence wait,
Genii with lamps are standing at the door;
Oh! he shall sing sweet songs, he shall relate
Wonder, and glory, and hopes untold before,
Murmur memories that may creep
Into his ears, of old sublime;
Let the youngest born of Time
Hear music in his sleep.

Quickly he shall awake, the East is bright,
And the hot glow of the unrisen sun
Hath kiss'd his brow with promise of its light,
His cheek is red with victory to be won.
Quickly shall our King awake,
Strong as giants, and arise;
Sager than the old and wise
The infant shall awake.

His childhood shall be froward, wild and thwart;
His gladness fitful, and his angers blind;
But tender spirits shall o'ertake his heart,
Sweet tears and golden moments, bland and kind.
He shall give delight and take,
Charm, enchant, dismay, and sooth;
Raise the dead, and touch with youth;
Oh! sing that he may wake!

Where is the sword to gird upon his thigh?
Where is his armour and his laurel crown?
For he shall be a conqueror ere he die,
And win him kingdoms wider than his own;
Like the earthquake he shall shake
Cities down, and waste like fire;
Then build them stronger, pile them higher,
When he shall awake.

In the dark spheres of his unclosed eyes
The sheeted lightnings lie, and clouded stars,
That shall glance softly, as in summer skies,
Or stream o'er thirsty deserts, winged with wars:
For in the pauses of dread hours
He shall fling his armour off,
And like a reveller sing and laugh,
And dance in ladies' bowers.

Oftimes in his Midsummer he shall turn
To look on the dead blooms with weeping eyes;
O'er ashes of frail Beauty stand and mourn,
And kiss the bier of stricken Hope with sighs.
Ofttimes like light of onward seas,
He shall hail great days to come,
Or hear the first dread not of doom,
Like torrents on the breeze.

His manhood shall be blissful and sublime,
With stormy sorrows, and severest pleasures,
And his crown'd age upon the top of Time
Shall throne him, great in glories, rich in treasures.
The sun is up, the day is breaking,
Sing ye sweetly, draw anear,
Immortal be the new-born year,
And blessed be its waking.

—*Fraser's Magazine for January.*

THE ENGLISH HUMORISTS.

The present difficulties of literary men, the hardships to which an author's position sometimes gives an undue prominence, arise, we are willing to confess, more from intellectual than moral causes. The whole aspect of the profession is changed. It was once a close corporation; its emoluments, such as they are, are now thrown open to universal competition. A peculiar feature of our present literature, and one which becomes every day more marked, is the immense number of persons from whom it proceeds. A university education, or, when that was wanting, some peculiar aptness of genius—some marked superiority of attainment—was once held to be a necessary preliminary to the literary career; and the great majority of publications proceeded from those who were either authors by calling, or members of a learned profession, to which authorship was a fit and frequent adjunct. The extension of the reading public; the increased commonness of a liberal culture; and, as much as these, the improved education given to the female sex, have effected a great change in these particulars. The exclamation of Juvenal, "Semper ego auditor tantum?" is practically uttered by every one who can construct an intelligible sentence, and by many who cannot; and the result is a book. Hardly a clever woman can go up the Rhine without describing her impressions. No barrister takes a vacation ramble but rushes into print before vacation again comes round. The earth is ransacked for new countries in which to travel, and about which to write. Novels are as plentiful as blackberries, and histories, like mushrooms, spring up in a night. On an average, a dozen poetic debuts take place every month. Those who dare not trust themselves to write, can review; and those whom editors will not have, are at least able to translate. We speak a literal truth when we say that it is difficult to find any person of either sex, of moderate age, attainments, and self-confidence, who has not made a first appearance in print, and therefore lays some claim to the *literary character.*

Is it under such circumstances wonderful that a large proportion of these adventures end only in failure? It must be notorious to any one who has at all modelled his taste upon the great works of antiquity, or learned English from our noble classics, that not few of the writers whose books daily issue from our fertile press have yet the rudiments of their art to acquire. We are ourselves decidedly of the opinion that literary success far overbalances literary desert. We know but few admirable books of which the public has not readily and enthusiastically applauded the merit. Poetry is a drug, cry the thousand aspirants to the bay-leaf; the age is prosaic, and our art is neglected. Tennyson is almost our only real poet; and though his poems do not, for the most part, appeal to any popular sympathies, the public will not be satisfied with large and numerous editions. There is a strain of pensive music in some of Longfellow's poems; and it is the critic, and not the poet or his publisher, who might have reason to complain of his popularity. And the recent fact that Alexander Smith's poems (which we have not seen) have already reached a second edition, is a proof that the public is not slow to recognise the solid claims of a perfectly unkown aspirant. The world dislikes solid learning, exclaims the would-be historian—who buries himself in the British Museum for six months, and emerges parent of two octavos—the taste of the age is frivolous He might take example by Gibbon, and recollect that the brain-child whose existence is to be healthy and prolonged must be the product of long gestation. We will not instance Macaulay, who has so amply fulfilled his own prophecy, that "a history of England might be the most fascinating book in the language, and more in request in the circulating-libraries than the last novel." Grote and Arnold are not light writers, nor their subjects immediately exciting; yet their works show signs of a long vitality. Hallam is too impartial to raise a sympathy, yet his volumes are on every shelf. Some men's philosophy is, no doubt, the dread of men, and gods, and booksellers; yet Mill and Whewell are both bought and read. The truth, which must be obvious to every candid inquirer, is that literary merit is as sure of its reward as any other; and that splendid abilities, to whatever theme directed, are still sure of splendid returns of fame and remuneration. And then there is a balance on the other side also. Success is won, which is partially, or not at all deserved. Many a novel owes its success to an adroit advocacy of popular opinions and prejudices. Many a flimsy history is buoyed into temporary circulation by a wealth of anecdote. Many a theological essay is sold in thousands, as an offering to sectarian unkindness. Many an unworthy effort is puffed into praise by the timely commendation of critics, and the use of great authorities. On the whole, we see no reason to doubt that public acceptance—taking into account the different degrees of that precious article expected by the heretical theologian and the popular novelist—is, on the average of a few years, a not unfair test of merit.

But then for mediocrity?

> "Mediocribus esse poetis,
> Non homines, non Dii, non concessere columnæ,"

says Horace, and the saying applies equally to every species of literary merit. A merchant of ordinary foresight and enterprise does not expect to die a Rothschild, but he makes a decent provision for his family; a barrister of moderate capacity and learning soon ceases to look up to the woolsack, and is content in his County Court Judgeship. If a man enter a profession for which nature has not supereminently endowed him, he must be satisfied with its lesser rewards; if, as is too often the case with literature, his own self-confidence hurries him into a vocation for which he is radically unfit, he need not complain of the public when the penalty due to his folly recoils upon himself. There are peculiar difficulties and a numerous host of disappointments attendant upon the literary profession; its rewards are unequally, sometimes unfairly distributed; its remuneration often scanty, and always uncertain; but all this the disappointed aspirant knew when he entered upon it in high disdain against the drudgery of the office or the counting-house. He only made a false estimate of his own powers, or, as he perhaps phrases it, of the public discrimination. What right does he thus acquire to declaim against the economical position of the author, or what claim does he substantiate against the public justice? Failure—especially if it be life-long and involve the wreck of a family—is always a fit object of social commiseration and relief; but why a poor shoemaker should not be as fully entitled to these as a poor author, we are unable to conceive. The genius of both may have been towards tailoring; and the whole gist of the matter is, that each has chosen a wrong vocation.

Sir Walter Scott, in common, we believe, with some other celebrated authors of our day, was in the habit of warning literary aspirants who applied to him for advice, never to trust to literature as the sole means of subsistence; an admonition which self-confidence no doubt often attributed to envy, and so blindly went on its way to disappointment. His example might have been as instructive as his admonition; for the Sheriff was at least as busy a man as the author of Waverly, and earned as certain if not so large a livelihood. There are few cases in which the public has not cause to regret the adoption of literature as a profession. There are few writers whose powers are so various, so ready, so equable, as to work for money as conscientiously as they work for fame; and if a man depends upon his pen for his daily bread, he has a very strong temptation to degrade authorship into bookmaking. The question he puts to himself is not, What useful and honourable work can I do in the field of letters? but, What will pay? and What will the public buy? And again, in regard to its execution; not, What time and labour must I bestow upon this book, to make it my best work? but, How long can I give to it, consistently with the exigencies of rent-day and butchers' bills? Such are the vulgar necessities which inundate our shelves with books, which not only themselves had better never have been written, but actually take away the fair opportunity for less imperfect efforts. By an odd application of the Rule of Three Inverse, the better a professional author succeeds, and the greater his merit, the less he writes. He can afford to rest on his oars, to recruit his strength between every effort, and to abstain from trying the public patience and want of discernment with a crude production. On the contrary, an ill success entails the speedy publication of another venture; and the men who write most are precisely those of whose works the public but half approve, and for which, therefore, the publishers pay only a starvation price.

We spoke above of the effect which the increased culture of the middle class, and especially of the female sex, has had in bringing an increased amount of literary labour into the market. And this affords one reason more why the young aspirant after literary honours, if he has the credit of authorcraft at heart, should place his chief reliance for subsistence on some commercial or professional labours. This is the age, we are told, of cheap literature. Series of every variety of price, from half-a-guinea down to sixpence; cheap republications; cheap translations; people's edition, dirty party, slovenly print, guady covers, double columns, and railway book-stalls, are enumerated at every Athenæum conversazione as among the characteristics of our century, and cited as proofs that we are rapidly advancing towards a period of universal knowledge. We are content to admit that the good effected is great; that the principle of small profits and quick returns may be inculcated on the booksellers with advantage both to them and the public; but does it never strike the philanthropic purchaser of cheap books, when he buys a closely printed octavo volume containing some five hundred pages of original matter or translation for three shillings, that somebody must pay the difference between that price and the half-guinea for which the volume was formerly sold? In the case of a coat purchased at the far-famed establishment of Moses, it is all plain; so much for cloth, so much for vending, and the rest screwed from the wages of the starving wretch who sews at twopence-half-penny a day. Let those who are about to adopt the literary profession be warned that this is not unlike the effect which cheap literature is producing upon authorcraft. The great prizes of letters are still open to the strong hand. But, on the other hand, the boundless competition for such hack work as abridgment, translation, and the like—which demand rather attainment than capacity—is raising up anew the race of Grub street scribblers which Goldsmith described, perhaps from his own chequered experience, and which in our day will be the reproach of letters, if not, as in his, their shame.

It was our original intention to have adverted also to the social position of authors; a subject to which Mr. Thackeray's epilogue alludes, and of which the literary biographies, so numerous of late, afford abundant illustration. But space and opportunity fail us. Had we done so, we could but have insisted on the necessity of that manly self-reliance, which can alone insure the author's pecuniary and moral independence. We have to thank Mr. Thackeray once more for a delightful book, inculcating a sound moral lesson. Literature is indeed an obdurate mistress, unless wooed with persuasions so powerful as his. She grants her favours but to few, and offers to none exemption from the ordinary ills of life. Yet we are persuaded that the only mode of remedying these mischiefs, which are undoubtedly too rife among the rank and file of the literary army, is for all who claim a personal interest in authorcraft to adopt and act upon Mr. Thackeray's honest exhortation, "Let us bear our ills with the same constancy with which others endure them, accept our manly part in life, and ask no more."—*Prospective Review.*

Thomas Babington Macaulay and Opium-eating.—Some months ago a statement went the rounds of the papers that the faculties of T. B. Macaulay, M.P., the celebrated Reviewer and Historian, were falling under the influence of free indulgence in opium.

When the statement first appeared, Dr. Durno, of this city, who was acquainted with Mr. Macaulay in England some years ago, addressed him a letter on the subject, and enclosed a copy of the story that was afloat. The following are extracts from Mr. Macaulay's reply, now before us:

London, Oct. 14, 1853.

"Dr. James Durno—*Sir:* I am obliged, and at the same time diverted, by your kind solicitude. I assure you that you need not be uneasy. The story which is going the rounds of your papers is an impudent lie, without the shadow of foundation. All the opium that I have swallowed in a life of fifty-three years does not amount to ten grains. I affirm, on my honour, that I never took even a drop of laudanum except in obedience to medical authority: and the last time I took any to the best of my remembrance, was when the cholera was here in 1849.

"My health, it is true, is delicate. I am very well at present. But, with the cold weather, my maladies will probably come back. My chest suffers much from the winter air. But everybody who knows me knows that my faculties and spirits have never flagged, and that, in spite of indisposition, I lead a most happy life.

"I cannot help feeling some indignation at the villany of the low-minded and bad-hearted man who could send such a calumny across the Atlantic. However, my indignation has already cooled into contempt, or nearly so. I will venture to say, that the writer of the letter in which this falsehood first appeared, never approached even the outskirts of the society in which I live, or he would have made his fiction a little more probable.

"I have the honour to be, sir, your obedient servant,
"T. B. Macaulay"

—*Albany Ex.*

PERSEVERANCE.

Take the spade of Perseverance;
Dig the field of Progress wide:
Every bar to true instruction
Carry out and cast aside;
Every stubborn weed of error,
Every weed that hurts the soil,
Tares, whose very growth is terror—
Dig them out, whate'er the toil!

Give the stream of Education
Broader channel, bolder force;
Hurl the stones of Persecution
Out where'er they block its course;
Seek for strength in self-exertion;
Work, and still have faith to wait;
Close the crooked gate to fortune;
Make the road to honour *straight!*

Men are agents for the Future!
As they work, so ages win
Either harvest of advancement,
Or the product of their sin!
Follow out true cultivation—
Widen Education's plan;
From the majesty of Nature
Teach the majesty of Man!

—*Charles Swain's Volume of Poems.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

The first part of Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, translated into Chinese, has just been printed in London.

—— The son of the Emperor of Hayti, an intelligent and gentlemanly youth, has arrived in England, to complete his education under a clergyman at Dawlish.

—— Nosegay.—Cleland, in his Gaelic Vocabulary, states that *gay* applied to *nosegay*, is derived from the Celtic language, in which *geach* denotes a *bough or bunch of flowers*, to be held to the nose.

—— A Good Guess.—"We are told," says Mr Doran, in the current number of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, "that Ariadne, abandoned by Theseus, was consoled by Bacchus; and nothing more, I think, is meant, than that the lady dried her tears and took to drinking."

—— Mr. John Martin, the painter of "Belshazzar's Feast," has suffered, it is stated, an attack of paralysis that disables his right hand, and impedes his utterance, though his hearing and sight remain perfect.

—— Two literary pensions have recently been conferred by Lord Aberdeen, as adviser of royalty—one, of £100 a year, to Alaric Watts, the poet; the other to the family of the late James Simpson, of Edinburgh, the long-tried labourer in the cause of working-class elevation and of popular education.

—— A Whipping Recorder.—Mr. Samuel Warren, Recorder of Hull, loves to season his sentences with plenty of whipcord. This propensity of Samuel's has been significantly rebuked by Lord Palmerston, who has remitted whippings and shortened terms of imprisonment. We understand that the judicial poet of "The Lily and the Bee" will—in self-justification—forthwith produce another poem, to be called "The Cat and her Tails."—*Punch.*

—— Mrs. Carlyle, the mother of the distinguished author, died at Scotsbrig, near Ecclefechan, Scotland, on Christmas day. Her two sons, one of whom is a doctor residing in London, and the author of various translations from the German, were present at the death-bed of their venerable and beloved parent. The doctor had waited upon his mother for a month with the most exemplary and patient love. Thomas Carlyle arrived from his residence at Chelsea a few days before the last scene, and on the spot where he was born witnessed the departure of a mother who had the satisfaction many years before her death, of seeing her family rise to well-merited distinction.

—— The *Times* observes that the young gentleman is no more taught common things than the young ploughman. "If he knows the name of a tree, a shrub, or a flower; if he knows seed-time and harvest, if he knows the name of a star, or can point out a planet, and has the least inkling of its movements; if he knows the map of England, or of his own country; if he knows more than by sensation the chymical qualities of the food that he eats; if he knows how mysteriously and wonderfully his own physical frame is made; if he knows the laws of motion and the application of the mechanical powers, the composition of a watch, or the nature of any one substance he can put his hands upon, he must have picked it up precariously, irregularly, and almost stealthily out of school, for school teaches him none of these things, any more than it does English literature or the history of his own country.

—— Spontaneous Combustion a Myth.—*Apropos* of science, Dr Frederick Lees, of Leeds, in a private letter to us, writes: "I have just been making an experiment in relation to the mooted question of spontaneous combustion, which, as I am writing to you, I may as well mention. Having had a *stomach* for the last seven years prepared in alcohol (not my own! for that I preserve without, as you know, but one taken at a *post mortem* from a drunkard, who was drowned), I thought that, as it had been well steeped in alcoholics both *before* and *after* death, it ought, when fired, to show at least some combustive behaviour akin to the case of poor *Krook*, if his happened to be a record of fact. I broke the head of the vessel, and set fire to the pint of alcohol in and around the organ. The spirit burnt away, and as it burnt it *singed* the upper part of the stomach, but when all the spirit was consumed the stomach was still there, stubbornly *incombustible*, as I expected."—*Leader.*

—— Table Turning Reproved by the Pope.—The *Gazette de France* publishes the following extract from a letter dated Rome the 25th ult., written by the Countess Sophia Kisseleff, and it guarantees its authenticity: I saw the Holy Father yesterday. What a blessing! He deigned to hear my confession, and he gave me absolution. I demanded for you also a blessing, and told him that you had made me question a table. We committed an enormous sin, and I shall ask pardon from God for all my life. The Holy Father condemns all these practices, and these communications with souls. It is the demon that takes all these forms; it is, as the Holy Father says, the sin of pride; it is desiring to know what it is forbidden to seek. The condemnation of such things is in the Bible. What a happiness it is to be a Catholic, and to be able to come to one who can absolve you! I supplicate you, dear friend, to say everywhere so far as you can that the Pope condemns all these practices of sorcery. The tables are a manner of entering into communication with the spirit of darkness.

—— Personal Appearance of Marie Antoinette.—Her precocious beauty eclipsed that of Madame du Barry, the favourite of Louis XV. and the modern Phryne. But the beauty of Madame du Barry was that of a courtezan; the beauty of Marie Antoinette was that of a princess. Nature had adorned her with all the gifts that made her, as a woman, an object of admiration, and, as a queen, an object for adoration; in shape tall, her movements were swan-like in carriage and deportment; in elegance such as to lose nothing of her majesty; her hair was blonde and silken, and its warm tints reminded the beholder of the wavy tresses of Titian; a lofty oval forehead, like to those of the fair daughters of the Danube; eyes of liquid azure, in which the calm and the tempest of the soul made the look by turns sleep or undulate; the nose slightly aquiline; the mouth Austrian, of her family, that is, a mingling of pride and of a smile; the chin turned up; her colour heightened by the chill climate of the north; an irresistible grace shed like a youthful vapour over all her features, and which did not allow her to be viewed but through an atmosphere of fire or of inebriation.—*Lamartine's History of the Constituent Assembly.*

—— Murray's "Handbook for South Italy" is just published, and contains some curious stories respecting Fra Rocco, the celebrated Dominican preacher and the spiritual Joe Miller of Naples. On one occasion, it is related, he preached on the mole a penitential sermon, and introduced so many illustrations of terror that he soon brought his hearers to their knees. While they were thus showing every sign of contrition, he cried out, "Now all you who sincerely repent of your sins, hold up your hands." Every man in the vast multitude immediately stretched out his hands. "Holy Archangel Michael," exclaimed Rocco, "thou who with thine adamantine sword standest at the right of the judgment seat of God, hew me off every hand which has been raised hypocritically." In an instant every hand dropped, and Rocco of course poured forth a fresh torrent of eloquent invective against their sins and their deceit. He had a great dislike to tobacco, and when once preaching to a crowd of Spanish sailors he astounded them by telling them that there were no Spanish saints in heaven. A few, he said, had been admitted, but they smoked so many cigars that they made the holy virgins sick, and St. Peter set his wits to work to get them out. At length he proclaimed that a bull fight was to be held outside the gate of Paradise. Thereupon every Spanish saint, without exception, ran off to see the fight, and St. Peter immediately closed the gates, and took care never to admit another Spaniard.

—— Autograph Letters of Charles I.—In an auction that took place last Friday and Saturday, under the direction of Messrs. Puttick and Simpson, of Piccadilly, there occurred an interesting series of letters of Charles I. The following is condensed from the sale catalogue: Lot 94. "Charles I. Sixty-one letters and notes written to Sir Wm. Hopkins, while the king was a prisoner in the Isle of Wight, concluding with one after his removal to Windsor Castle. July 12 to Dec. 30, 1648. The letters are mostly in a feigned hand, and are written on scraps of paper of all forms and sizes, according to the necessity of the moment. The king's practice appears to have been to have deposited his letters in some receptacle, whence they were removed by the women who attended upon him (who, he says, could neither write nor read), and the daily clearances thus made were no doubt anxiously watched for by some discreet adherent, who was in the secret, the letter selected and duly transmitted. The subject of the letters is mainly the projected escape of the king, whose firm, patient, and even cheerful demeanour in circumstances the most perilous, is exhibited most forcibly in this series of letters." An extract from one of these letters will be sufficient to show their interesting character. It is from a letter dated October 9, 1648: "I pray you rightly to understand my condition (which I confess yesternight I did not fully anufe through want of tyme) it is this: Notwithstanding my too great concessions already made, I know that, unless I shall make yet others, which will directly make me no king, I shall be, at best, a perpetuall prisoner; besydes if this were not (of which I am too sure) the adhering to the church (from which I cannot depart no, not in show) will doe the same; and, to deale freely with you, the great concession I made this day was meerely in order to my escape, of which if I had not hope I would not have done; for then I could have returned to my straight Prison without reluctancy, but now I confess it would breake my hart, having done that which only an escape can justify," &c. This interesting collection sold for fifty-one guineas. The other lots in the sale were chiefly foreign and unimportant.

—— Comparative Size of Ancient and Modern Vessels—At the last meeting of the Institution of Civil Engineers, the discussion upon the paper "on ocean steamers" commenced by quoting an article in the *Edinburgh Journal*, by Professor Tennant the dimensions of some of the large ships built by the ancients, whence it appeared that a ship constructed by Ptolemæus Philopater was 420 feet long, 56 feet broad, and 72 feet high from the keel to the prow; and was manned by four thousand rowers, four hundred servants, and two thousand eight hundred and twenty mariners. Hiero, King of Syracuse, caused to be built, by Archias, the Corinthian shipwright, under the supervision of Archimedes, a vessel which appeared to have been armed for war, and sumptuously fitted for a pleasure yacht, and yet was ultimately used to carry corn; the dimensions were not recorded; but, as there were twenty banks of oars, and three masts, the timber for the mainmast, after being in vain sought for in Italy, being brought from England, and the cargo was sixty thousand measures of corn, besides vast quantities of provisions, &c., for the crew, the dimensions must have exceeded those of any ships of the present day. The burthen and cubic contents of these vessels would be:

	Tonage.	External Bulk
Ptolomæus Philopater's ship....	6,445 tons,	830,700 cubic ft.
Noah's Ark..............................	11,905 ,,	1,580,000 ,,

And contrasting with these a few modern ships:

Great Western.................	1,242 tons,	161,100 cubic ft.
Great Britain....................	3,445 ,,	446,570 ,,
Arctic (American packet)......	2,745 ,,	356,333 ,,
Hymalaya.........................	3,528 ,,	457;332 ,,

and, calculating by the same rules, taking the dimensions given in the prospectus of the Eastern Steam Navigation Company, their

Proposed Iron ship............	22,942 tons,	2,973,593 cubic ft

It was however, stated that this vessel was intended to be 10,000 tons register, which might be correct, if it was built on the cellular system, and was measured internally, by the present law.

—— Useful Purposes served by the Beard.—It is occasionally urged that beards are dirty appendages, such as dust gatherers. So far from being an encourager of filth, the beard, on the contrary, is an efficient protection against it. It gathers dust and dirt only to prevent their being inhaled into the lungs, or stopping up the pores of the skin. This important office it performs much in the same way that the eyelashes and the short hairs in the ears and nostrils protect the organs about which they are placed. And it would be quite as sensible an operation for a man to clip his eyelashes every morning as to remove his beard and moustache. The dirt which the beard collects can be more easily removed than if, by the absence of the beard, it were allowed to lodge itself in the pores of the skin. Because a man with a beard of one or two days' growth looks dirty, people are apt to conclude that it is the beard which caused that appearance, while it is only its shortness that does so; as soon as it has attained some length it no longer looks dirty. There are many who in their own minds are convinced of the folly of flying in the face of nature by cutting the beard, but who lack the moral courage to follow their convictions. The beard, indeed, is a tender point for foolish ridicule to aim its shafts at. Every man who has passed the age of twenty knows what stereotyped, but yet cutting jests, his youthful whiskers have had to encounter. Many a man who might have faced the cannon's mouth has felt the laughter of fools too much for him. The only way to conquer this redicule is to learn to dispise it. If a man were to turn aside by every laugh he would be a living weathercock. Many persons are now becoming somewhat ashamed of the antiquated prejudices against a most becoming and useful ornament to the human face divine. I might quote numerous medical authorities to prove the utility of the growth of the hair on the upper lip, especially of men who, in their professional avocations, are liable to exposure to all the ever varying changes of season and climate, now subject to the chilling damps, freezing cold, or unwholesome night vapours, and anon to hot parching winds, or the scorching rays of a powerful vertical sun. But we shall rest satisfied with the *prima facie* evidence afforded by the fact that an all wise Creator, for some useful and benevolent purpose has ordained that the masculine face shall be protected and adorned by the growth of hair. Irrespective, therefore, of considerations of health and comfort, we fly in the face of God's providence, when we inconsiderately divest our features of every particle of their natural protection.—*Rowland on the Hair.*

—— Love and Fear.—"How many motives we have for love, how much there is in the universe to kindle our admiration and to claim our gratitude, there are, happily, multitudes among us who both feel and teach. But it has not, I think, been sufficiently considered how evident throughout that system of creation is the purpose of God that we should often be affected by fear; not the sudden, selfish, and contemptible fear of immediate danger, but the fear which arises out of the contemplation of great powers in destructive operation, and generally from the perception of the presence of death. Nothing appears to me more remarkable than the array of scenic magnificence by which the imagination is appalled in myriads of instances when the actual danger is comparatively small, so that the utmost possible impression of awe shall be produced upon the minds of all, though direct suffering is inflicted upon few. Consider, for instance, the moral effect of a single thunderstorm. Perhaps two or three persons may be struck dead within the space of a hundred square miles; and their deaths, unaccompanied by the scenery of the storm, would produce little more than a momentary sadness in the busy hearts of living men. But the preparation for the judgment by all that mighty gathering of the clouds; by the questioning of the forest leaves in their terrified stillness which way the wind shall go forth; by the murmuring to each other, deep in the distance of the Destroying Angels, before they draw forth their swords of fire; by the march of the funeral darkness in the midst of the noonday, and the rattling of the dome of heaven beneath the chariot-wheels of death; on how many minds do not these produce an impression almost as great as the actual witnessing of the fatal issue! and how strangely are the expessions of threatening elements fitted to the apprehension of the human soul! The lurid colour, the long, irregular, convulsive, sound the ghastly shapes of flaming and heaving clouds, all are as true and faithful in their appeal to our instinct of danger, as the moaning or wailing of the human voice itself is to our instinct of pity It is not a reasonable, calculating terror which they awake in us; it is no matter that we count distance by seconds, and measure probability by averages. That shadow of the thunder cloud will still do its work upon our hearts, and we shall watch its passing away, as if we stood on the thrashing-floor of Araunah. — *Ruskin's Stories of Venice.*